ORIGINAL

0000023305

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

2001 OCT 10 P 4: 22

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

OCT 10 2001

DOCKETED BY

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
CHAIRMAN

JIM IRVIN
COMMISSIONER

MARC SPITZER
COMMISSIONER

IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S COMPLIANCE WITH §271 OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.	DOCKET NO. T-00000A-97-0238

QWEST CORPORATION'S REPORT ON THE STATUS OF CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS REDESIGN

Qwest Corporation hereby provides its status report regarding the meetings it has held with CLEC representatives regarding the redesign of Qwest's Change Management Process ("CMP").[1] This is the first monthly status report on the redesign process. While this docket remains open, Qwest will file additional reports every month until the completion of the redesign process. Qwest proposes that CLECs and other parties to this proceeding be given a reasonable amount of time, such as two weeks, to file comments on this report, including comments regarding impasse issues identified in the report, if any.

---

[1] Qwest's CMP was formerly known as the "Co-Provider Industry Change Management Process" or "CICMP." The CLECs participating in that process chose to change the name to "Change Management Process."

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Qwest proposed that the CLEC community participate in the redesign of the CMP to address key concerns regarding the process raised in the section 271 workshops regarding Qwest's change management process. Thus, CMP redesign sessions were established and the CLEC community has chosen core members to represent their companies. Qwest commends the CLECs for their active participation in redesigning Qwest's CMP. CLEC representatives and Qwest have discussed many issues in the twelve full days of meetings held since July 11, 2001 regarding the redesign of Qwest's CMP. As a general matter, the parties agreed to address systems issues first, then address product and process issues.

The process has resulted in the parties agreeing on interim solutions pending final approval on many issues, including the scope of CMP and escalation and dispute resolution processes for the CMP. The parties have also agreed in principle to interim processes for change requests ("CRs") to be submitted by CLECs for systems issues, and CRs to be submitted by Qwest and CLECs relating to product and process issues. The parties have agreed upon the redesign process itself, including a process for resolution of disputes that cannot be resolved in redesign meetings. The process involves identifying impasse issues in these monthly reports. The process is:

> The CLEC participants and Qwest CMP representatives will make every attempt to resolve the issue through collaborative discussions and using the Impasse Resolution Process. However, if the result of the Impasse Resolution Process remains in an impasse, there are two options to resolve this specific issue. And they are:

---

[2] There remains an open issue regarding timing of Qwest's responses to escalations.

- Qwest will file monthly status reports regarding this process in its 271 proceedings, including in Colorado, Washington, Arizona, Nebraska, Oregon, the 7-State Process, Minnesota and South Dakota. Qwest will identify any current impasse issues in those reports, or CLECs may identify impasse issues in their comments on the reports, to be treated as impasse issues in the 271 process. If Qwest fails to file a monthly status report, a CLEC may submit the impasse issue to the commission to be treated as impasse issues in the 271 process.

- Following the date upon which a commission no longer accepts the impasse issues in a 271 proceeding, Qwest or any CLEC may submit the issue following the commission's established procedures with the appropriate regulatory agency requesting resolution of the dispute. This provision is not intended to change the scope of any regulatory agency's authority with regard to Qwest or the CLECs.

The interim solutions agreed to by the core redesign team provide that Qwest may implement the agreements made in the CMP redesign process as early as practicable, with the understanding that those agreements are subject to change until the CMP is finalized. Qwest has established a website where it as posted the redesign minutes and other materials. The website address is www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/redesign.

II. AGREEMENTS REACHED ARE TRACKED IN THE INTERIM DRAFT MASTER REDLINED DOCUMENT.

The parties agreed to use the OBF's Issue 2233 version 1 as a starting point for discussion and a working document. Qwest agreed to track the parties' agreements in that document, which is entitled "Interim Draft Master Redlined Document." A copy of this document, reflecting agreements reached through the October 2 and 3 meetings, is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The parties have not agreed to all of the text in the Interim Draft Master Redlined Document. For ease of reference, the portions of this document that represent the parties' agreements are formatted in regular typeface, while the portions of the document that have not yet been discussed appear in italic font.

The parties have agreed that the terms "interim" and "draft" have special significance as they are used in the document title, "Interim Draft Master Redlined Document." The agreements presented in the Interim Draft Master Redlined Document are interim agreements in that Qwest can implement those agreements as soon as practicable. At the same time, the agreements remain in draft form because they are subject to change throughout the redesign process. At the end of the redesign process, the parties will review the document as a whole and make necessary changes to ensure that the discrete agreements reached regarding different issues fit together into a cohesive and integrated whole.

Significantly, the parties have agreed to the scope of CMP. *See* Exhibit A at 4-6. The Introduction and Scope reads as follows:

> This document defines the processes for change management of OSS interfaces, products and processes (including manual) as described below. CMP provides a means to address changes that support or affect pre-ordering, ordering/provisioning, maintenance/repair and billing capabilities and associated documentation and production support issues for local services provided by CLECs to their end users.
>
> The CMP is managed by CLEC and Qwest representatives each having distinct roles and responsibilities. The CLECs and Qwest will hold regular meetings to exchange information about the status of existing changes, the need for new changes, what changes Qwest is proposing, how the process is working, etc. The process also allows for escalation to resolve disputes, if necessary.
>
> Qwest will track changes to OSS interfaces, products and processes. The CMP includes the identification of changes and encompasses, as applicable, [requirement definition, design, development, notification, testing, implementation and disposition of changes – revisit list]. Qwest will process any such changes in accordance with the CMP described in this document.
>
> The CMP is dynamic in nature and, as such, is managed through the regularly scheduled meetings. This document may be revised, through the procedures described in section (X).

The parties also agreed to an escalation and dispute resolution process. *See* Exhibit A at 33-35, 39-40. In order to address CLEC concerns that multi-level escalations are too time-

consuming, Qwest agreed to a single level escalation process where Qwest provides a single binding position on the issue. Qwest must respond to escalations within 7 days if it relates to a CR; otherwise, Qwest must respond within 14 days. The dispute resolution process allows the parties to agree to resolve the dispute through alternative dispute resolution or to submit the issue to an appropriate regulatory agency.

The parties have also reached agreement in principle regarding interim processes pursuant to which the CLECs will submit CRs relating to systems issues and Qwest and the CLECs will submit CRs relating to product and process issues.

The interim process for Qwest-generated product and process changes was developed in response to concerns raised by CLECs. Several CLECs submitted a "Written Summary Regarding Qwest's Proposed Process For Qwest Changes To Product, Process, And Technical Documentation Submitted To CMP & CMP Re-Design Team by CMP Participants Allegiance, AT&T, Covad, Eschelon, Integra, Sprint, and WorldCom," dated September 25, 2001. In this joint submission, attached as Exhibit H, the CLECs described several specific concerns regarding Qwest's proposed process for Qwest changes to products, processes, and technical documentation and publications. In response to these concerns, Qwest immediately developed a proposal to address the issues the CLECs raised and presented it at the next CMP redesign meeting. Qwest's proposed solution was discussed and modified by the parties, resulting in the parties' agreement to the Interim Qwest Product/Process Change Management Process set forth in Exhibit E.

Exhibit E sets forth the Interim Qwest Product/Process Change Management Process governing Qwest's submission of CRs regarding product/process issues. The agreed process provides that Qwest will submit a CR for changes to products/processes that alter CLEC

operating procedures, including the proposed changes in redlined form, if practicable, or with the changes highlighted if redlining is not practicable. In either case, Qwest will also include a historical log listing each change, the version of the document changed, the date of the change, and the reason for and source of the change. The process also provides for discussion of Qwest's product/process CR at the CMP meetings and a period for CLEC comments. For changes that do not alter CLEC operating procedures, Qwest must provide notice of the changes in the same format required for changes that do alter CLEC operating procedures, and a period for CLEC comment. Any issue relating to either type of change that cannot be resolved may be submitted through the escalation and dispute resolution processes.

Exhibits F and G are flow charts that depict the interim processes regarding CLEC CRs for product/process and for systems, to which the parties have agreed in principle.

In addition, the parties have agreed to provisions relating to the management, structure, and logistics of Qwest's CMP meetings. *See* Exhibit A at 22-30.

III. ISSUES DISCUSSED IN CMP REDESIGN MEETINGS

In the meetings to date, the parties' discussions have touched on a wide range of issues. Copies of the meeting minutes from the meetings held to date are attached here to as Exhibit B. Specifically, the parties have addressed the following issues on the Arizona Issue Log for Workshop No. 6: Section 12, General Terms and Conditions, CICMP, BFR, June 13-15, 2001.

Clarity and accessibility of Qwest CICMP documents (Issue CM-1). The parties have discussed the need and ability to clarify and make available Qwest's CMP documents. Qwest has agreed to CLEC requests to enhance the design of the CMP website to increase ease of navigation and locating specific documents. Qwest continues to improve its web site.

Definition and adequacy of Qwest's escalation and dispute resolution process (Issue CM-2). The parties have discussed and agreed upon an escalation and dispute resolution process for the CMP. Those processes are set forth at pp. 33-35, 39-40 of Exhibit A. As described above, these agreements will remain in draft form until the conclusion of the redesign process in order to allow for any necessary adjustments.

Five categories of changes in SBC documents (Issue CM-3). While the parties have not fully discussed or reached agreement on the categories of changes to be included in Qwest's CMP, Exhibit A includes all five categories of system changes included in SBC's documents. Those categories are listed in Exhibit A under the heading "Changes to Existing Interfaces." Qwest has already implemented the five categories of changes in its OSS CMP process.

Performance measurements for change management (Issue CM-4). Performance measurements for CMP are being discussed in the ROC TAG and are not a subject of the redesign meetings. To date, the parties have agreed upon one new performance measurement, PO-16, which measures timeliness of release notifications. The ROC TAG discussions regarding other change management measures are continuing.

Repair process subject to change management (Issue CM-5). Qwest has committed to including repair processes in CMP. The parties' agreement on the scope of the CMP reflects that commitment. *See* Exhibit A at pp. 4-6.

Frequency of scheduled CICMP meetings (Issue CM-6). The parties have agreed that CMP will be conducted on a regularly scheduled basis, at least on a monthly basis. At the CLECs' request based on the volume of issues to be addressed at these monthly forums, Qwest agreed to change the monthly forum format to include two separate full day meetings, with one

full day dedicated to system CMP issues and one full day dedicated to product and process CMP issues.

Qwest-generated CRs (Issue CM-7). Qwest has committed to include Qwest originated CRs regarding existing interfaces where the proposed change would require a CLEC to make internal changes, such as software design and/or code for an application-to-application interface, in order to take advantage of the enhancement or new functionality, process or product. As stated above, the parties have not yet discussed the types of changes that will be subject to the CR process.

Proprietary CR (Issue CM-8). Exhibit A currently does not contain provisions for proprietary CRs. The parties have not discussed whether to include proprietary CRs in the process.

EDI draft worksheet availability (Issue CM-9). Qwest has committed to comply with the Requirements Review section of Exhibit A, which contains the OBF timeframes of 73 days for change notification of Type 4 and 5 changes, 66 days for delivery of draft business rules and technical specifications, and 45 days for change confirmations through publication of final business rules and technical specifications. The redesign team has not yet discussed this issue.

Whether CLECs have had input into the development of the CMP (Issue CM-10). CLECs are actively participating in the redesign meetings.

WCom not allowed to vote on EDI CRs (Issue CM-12). This issue has not yet been addressed in the redesign meetings.

Scope of CMP (Issue CM-13 and 16). The parties have reached agreement regarding the definition of the scope of the CMP, which is set forth in the Interim Draft Master Redlined Document. *See* Exhibit A, Introduction and Scope, at pp. 4-6.

Whether Contents of Exhibit G should be included in SGAT (Issue CM-14). Qwest has conceded this issue, and the parties to the redesign effort have discussed revisions to SGAT Section 12.2.6. Qwest has made some changes to Section 12.2.6 at the request of CLECs, but the parties have not agreed upon the language in the entire paragraph. Qwest's proposal regarding Section 12.2.6 is attached as Exhibit C.

Whether Contents of Exhibit H should be included in SGAT (Issue CM-15). Qwest has conceded this issue, and the parties to the redesign effort have discussed revisions to SGAT Section 12.2.6. Qwest has made some changes to Section 12.2.6 at the request of CLECs, but the parties have not agreed upon the language in the entire paragraph. Section 12.2.6 refers to just Exhibit G, because Exhibit H (the escalation process) is now included within Exhibit G. Qwest's proposal regarding Section 12.2.6 is attached as Exhibit C.

Processes for notification of CLECs and adequacy of process (Issue CM-17). While the parties have not reached final agreement regarding notification processes, they have reached agreement on the basic categories of notifications and a naming convention for Qwest's CLEC notifications.

Documents described and as yet unidentified or unknown, which include the change request prioritization process and other links (Issue CM-18). The change request prioritization process will be addressed at future redesign meetings.

IV. SCHEDULE FOR REMAINING DISCUSSIONS

The schedule of upcoming meetings, including proposed subjects, is attached as Exhibit D and is subject to change based on the progress made by the parties.

VI. CONCLUSION

Qwest appreciates the time and effort the CLECs have devoted to participating in the redesign of Qwest's CMP. Qwest is confident that the collaborative redesign process will result in an effective CMP that meets CLEC needs and is consistent with industry practices.

Dated this 10th day of October, 2001.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew D. Crain, No. 029659
Qwest Corporation
1801 California Street, Suite 4900
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: (303) 672-5823

FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.
Timothy Berg
Theresa Dwyer
3003 North Central Ave., Suite 2600
Phoenix, AZ 85012
(602) 916-5421

Attorneys for Qwest Corporation

ORIGINAL +10 copies filed this 10th day of October, 2001, with:

Docket Control
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, AZ

COPY of the foregoing delivered this day to:

Maureen A. Scott
Legal Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 W. Washington St.
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Steve Olea, Acting Director
Utilities Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 W. Washington St.
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Lyn Farmer, Chief Administrative Law Judge
Hearing Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Caroline Butler
Legal Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 W. Washington St.
Phoenix, AZ 85007

COPY of the foregoing mailed this day to:

Steven H. Kukta
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY
1850 Gateway Drive, 7th floor
San Mateo, CA 94404-2567

Eric S. Heath
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS CO.
100 Spear Street, Suite 930
San Francisco, CA 94105

Thomas Campbell
Lewis & Roca
40 N. Central Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Joan S. Burke
Osborn Maledon, P.A.
2929 N. Central Ave., 21st Floor
PO Box 36379
Phoenix, AZ 85067-6379

Thomas F. Dixon
Worldcom, Inc.
707 17th Street # 3900
Denver, CO 80202

Scott S. Wakefield
Residential Utility Consumer Office
2828 North Central Ave., Suite 1200
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Michael M. Grant
Todd C. Wiley
Gallagher & Kennedy
2575 E. Camelback Rd.
Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225

Michael Patten
Roshka Heyman & DeWulf
400 North Fifth St., Ste. 1000
Phoenix, AZ 85004-3906

Bradley Carroll, Esq.
Cox Arizona Telcom, LLC
1550 West Deer Valley Rd.
Phoenix, AZ 85027

Daniel Waggoner
Davis, Wright & Tremaine
2600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101-1688

Traci Grundon
Davis Wright & Tremaine
1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue
Portland, OR 97201

Richard S. Wolters
Maria Arias-Chapleau
AT&T Law Department
1875 Lawrence Street # 1575
Denver, CO 80202

David Kaufman
e.Spire Communications, Inc.
343 W. Manhattan Street
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Alaine Miller

XO Communications, Inc.
500 108th Ave. NE, Suite 2200
Bellevue, WA 98004

Diane Bacon, Legislative Director
Communications Workers of America
5818 N. 7th St., Suite 206
Phoenix, Arizona 85014-5811

Philip A. Doherty
545 South Prospect Street, Suite 22
Burlington, VT 05401

W. Hagood Bellinger
5312 Trowbridge Drive
Dunwoody, GA 30338
Joyce Hundley
U.S. Dept. of Justice
Antitrust Division
1401 H Street, NW, # 8000
Washington, DC 20530

Andrew O. Isar
Telecommunications Resellers Association
4312 92nd Ave., NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98335

Raymond S. Heyman
Two Arizona Center
400 North 5th Street, Suite 1000
Phoenix, AZ 85004-3906

Douglas Hsiao
Rhythms Links, Inc.
6933 Revere Parkway
Englewood, CO 80112

Mark Dioguardi
Tiffany and Bosco, PA
500 Dial Tower
1850 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Thomas L. Mumaw
Snell & Wilmer
One Arizona Center

Phoenix, AZ 85004-0001

Charles Kallenbach
American Communications Services, Inc.
131 National Business Parkway
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Lyndon J. Godfrey
Vice President – Government Affairs
AT&T
675 E. 500 S.
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Gena Doyscher
Global Crossing Services, Inc.
1221 Nicollet Mall
Minneapolis, MN 55403-2420

Andrea Harris, Senior Manager
Allegiance Telecom, Inc. of Arizona
2101 Webster, Ste. 1580
Oakland, CA 94612

Gary L. Lane, Esq.
6902 East 1st Street, Suite 201
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

J. David Tate
Senior Counsel
SBC Telecom, Inc.
5800 Northeast Parkway, Suite 125
San Antonio, Texas 78249

M. Andrew Andrade
Tess Communications, Inc.
5261 S. Quebec Street Ste. 150
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

K. Megan Doberneck, Esq.
Covad Communications
4250 Burton Street
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Richard Sampson
Z-Tel Communications, Inc.
601 S. Harbour Island, Ste. 220

Tampa, Florida 33602

Lisa Crowley
Regional Counsel
Covad Communications Company
4250 Burton Drive
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Adrienne M. Anderson
Paralegal
Covad Communications Company
7901 Lowry Boulevard
Denver, Colorado 80230

1232891/67817.150

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
Revised—October 3, 2001

UPCOMING WORKING SESSIONS

Dates/Time	Location	Element
DATE: Tues., Oct 16 **TIME:** 9 am-5 pm **MT** 10 am-6 pm **CT** Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conf Rm. Denver, CO	• Change Request Initiation (CLEC and Qwest) • Changes to an Existing Interface – Application-to-Application – Graphical User Interface • Prioritization of OSS Change Requests—begin discussion
DATE: Tues., Oct 30, Wed., Oct 31, and Thurs, Nov 1 **TIME:** 9 am-5 pm **MT** 10 am-6 pm **CT** Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conf Rm. Denver, CO	• Prioritization of OSS Change Requests—continue discussion • Introduction of a New Interface • Retirement of an Existing Interface • Interface Testing • Exception Process
DATE: Tues., Nov 13 **TIME:** 9 am-5 pm **MT** 10 am-6 pm **CT** Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conf Rm. Denver, CO	• Production Support • Training • Re-visit the CMP Web Site section • Managing the CMP • Determine elements for Product and Process CMP discussions (future sessions)
DATE: Tues., Nov 27- Thurs. Nov 29 **TIME:** 9 am-5 pm **MT** 10 am-6 pm **CT** Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conf Rm. Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on OSS Interface or begin discussion on Product/Process
DATE: Mon., Dec 10 and Tues. Dec 11 **TIME:** 9 am-5 pm **MT** 10 am-6 pm **CT** Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conf Rm. Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on OSS Interface or begin discussion on Product/Process

Note: Agenda will include standing items—Review Core Team participation, Issue/Action Items, Review redlined document, Final Meeting Minutes from the previous session, and Set/Confirm agenda for the next working session. An half hour at the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
Revised—October 3, 2001

WORKING SESSIONS ALREADY HELD

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Thursday, July 11—COMPLETED	1801 California Street, Denver, CO	• Kickoff
Thursday, July 19—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Introduction • Scope • Administration—Managing the Change Management Process
Tuesday, August 7 and Wednesday, August 8—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Performance Measurements (informational) • Notification Process • Distribution List • Web Site • Tracking (e.g., CR and RN status definition, naming convention)
Tuesday, August 14 and Thursday, August 16—COMPLETED	1005 – 17th Street, 1st Floor, Junior Board Room Denver, CO	• Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Change)—to be continued • Prioritization—re-scheduled • Exception Process (added by Qwest after 7/19 meeting)—re-scheduled
Wednesday, Sep 5 and Thursday, Sep 6—COMPLETED	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO	• Interim Exception Process • Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Change)—re-scheduled • Prioritization—re-scheduled • Exception Process—re-scheduled

Note: Agenda will include standing items—Review Core Team participation, Issue/Action Items, Review redlined document, Final Meeting Minutes from the previous session, and Set/Confirm agenda for the next working session. An half hour at the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
Revised—October 3, 2001

WORKING SESSIONS ALREADY HELD (continued)

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Tuesday, Sep 18 and Thursday, Sep 20—COMPLETED	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO	• Escalation and Dispute Resolution Process • Re-visit Introduction and Scope (continuing on Oct 2) • Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Change)—to be continued • Release Requirements (e.g., Initial, Walk-through, Comment Cycle, Final, Release Testing)—re-scheduled due to agenda changes • Prioritization—re-scheduled due to agenda changes • Exception Process—re-scheduled due to agenda changes
Tuesday, Oct 2 and Wednesday, Oct 3—COMPLETED	200 South 5th Street, 1st Floor, Multi-purpose Room, Minneapolis, Minnesota and 1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conf Rm. Denver, CO	• Qwest's 271 Status Report to CO PUC • Introduction and Scope • Change Request Initiation (continue on Oct 16) • Changes to an Existing Interface (rescheduled)

Note: Agenda will include standing items—Review Core Team participation, Issue/Action Items, Review redlined document, Final Meeting Minutes from the previous session, and Set/Confirm agenda for the next working session. An half hour at the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues.

INTERIM QWEST PRODUCT/PROCESS CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Qwest is in the process of updating the documentation it provides to CLECs as a result of the commitments it has made in the workshops and as a result of issues that have been identified in OSS testing. The following is the process Qwest will follow until the completion of the redesign process for Qwest's CMP for product and process changes:

I. Changes that alter CLEC operating procedures.

As soon as practicable before the next scheduled CMP monthly meeting, Qwest shall ~~submit~~ distribute notification and post on the CMP web site a Change Request and related documentation for changes that alter CLEC operating procedures for pre-ordering, order/provisioning, maintenance/repair and billing for local services. The CR shall describe the change to be made to the process, along with any proposed changes to Qwest documentation available to CLECs. The CR will include the following: ~~If practicable, Qwest will provide a redlined version indicating the changes from the prior document version. If providing redlined versions is not practicable, Qwest will indicate the changes in the documentation. Qwest will indicate the source of the changes~~.

- If practicable, a red-lined version of each changed document showing changes from the most recent document version;
- If providing a red-lined version is not practicable for a document, a version of the document with changes highlighted;
- For each changed document, a historical log listing each change, the version of the document changed, the date of the change, and the reason for and source of the change.

Qwest will discuss ~~present~~ the CR at the next CMP Monthly Forum. ~~Under special circumstance,~~ CLECs or Qwest may request that a special CMP Forum be held to address a CR or to invoke the CMP Exception Process. At the CMP meeting, the parties will discuss whether comments are necessary, and time frames for such comments, if applicable. Unless another schedule is agreed to at the CMP meeting, the following procedure will be followed:

- Any CLEC ~~All CMP members~~ may file comments on the CR within 15 days of the CMP Monthly Forum.

- Within 15 days, Qwest will respond to comments and provide a final notice of the changes, along with any proposed changes to Qwest documentation available to CLECs. The notification shall be provided to CLECs at least 15 days before the effective date of the change.

Any CLEC may raise issues relating to its comments at any CMP meeting held before or after the effective date of the change. Any issues that cannot be resolved may be submitted to the Escalation and/or Dispute Resolution Processes as set forth in the CMP Re-Design Master Red Lined Document.

II. Changes that do not alter CLEC operating procedures.

For changes that do not alter CLEC operating procedures for pre-ordering, order/provisioning, maintenance/repair and billing for local services, Qwest shall provide notice of such changes to CLECs, along with any changes to Qwest documentation available to CLECs. ~~If practicable, Qwest will provide a redlined version indicating the changes from the prior document version. If providing redlined versions is not practicable, Qwest will indicate the changes in the documentation. Qwest will indicate the source of the changes~~. The change notice will include the following:

- If practicable, a red-lined version of each changed document showing changes from the most recent document version;
- If providing a red-lined version is not practicable for a document, a version of the document with changes highlighted;
- For each changed document, a historical log listing each change, the version of the document changed, the date of the change, and the reason for and source of the change.

CLECs may submit comments to Qwest, which will be posted on the CMP web site. Within 15 days of receipt, Qwest will respond to comments submitted by CLECs. Any CLEC may raise issues relating to its comments at any CMP meeting held before or after the effective date of the change. Any issues that cannot be resolved may be submitted to the Escalation and/or Dispute Resolution Processes as set forth in the CMP Re-Design Master Red Lined Document.

Interim CMP CLEC Originated CR Work Flow for Product/Process

Work	Flow Step	Description	Status Phase	Milestone
1	CLEC Request (CR Submitted	• CLEC e-mails completed CR Form to Qwest's CMP Manager • Qwest's CMP Manager reviews CR for completeness, assigns a CR Number and inputs CR into CMP Database. (2 business days) • Qwest CMP Manager forwards CR to CMP Group Manager • Qwest CMP Manager sends acknowledgment of receipt and logged CR to the CR submitter. • Qwest CMP Manager post submitted CR to the CMP web site (posting is updated as required) (2 days after acknowledgment)	Submission	CR Received
1A	Qwest Originated Change Created	• Process to be determined.		
2	Subject Matter Expert Assigned	• CMP Group Manager assigns a Change Management Project Manager (CRPM) and identifies the appropriate Director responsible for the CR. • CRPM obtains from the Director the assigned Subject Matter Expert(s) (SME).	Submission	SME Assigned
3	SME & CLEC Clarification Meeting	• CRPM Coordinates and holds a Clarification Meeting with the Originating CLEC and Qwest's SMEs within eight (8) business days after receipt of the submitted CR. At the Clarification Meeting, Qwest and the Originating CLEC will review the submitted CR, validate the intent of the Originating CLEC's CR, clarify all aspects, identify all questions that need to be answered and deliverables to be produced that would answer the Originating CLECs CR. • CRPM will document and issue confirming meeting minutes. • Qwest's SMEs will internally identify options and potential solutions to the CR. • CRs received by the first of the month (1st business day of the Month) will be presented at the next Monthly CMP Meeting. The Originating CLEC will present its CR and provide any business reasons for the CR. Clarifications identified during the prior Clarification Meeting will be identified. Participating CLECs will be given the opportunity to comment on the CR and subsequent clarifications. Clarifications and/or modifications related to the CR will be incorporated. Qwest's SME will present options and potential solutions to the CR. General consensus will be obtained from the participating CLECs as to the appropriate direction/solution for Qwest's SME to take in responding to the CR.	Clarification	Alignment Completed
4	Qwest Response Issued	• Qwest's SMEs will develop a draft response based on the direction from the Monthly CMP Meeting. The Qwest SMEs will obtain Qwest Director's acceptance and submit the response to the CRPM. Qwest's Responses will either be "Accepted (Qwest plans to adhere to CLEC request) with position stated, or "Denied" (Qwest does not plan to adhere to CLEC request) with detailed basis for the denial including reference to substantiating material. • The CRPM will have the response posted to the WEB, inputted to CMP Database and CLECs notified.	Evaluation Presented	Qwest Response Issued
5	Qwest Response Presented -	• Qwest Responses issued prior to one (1) week before the Monthly CMP Meeting will be presented at the Monthly CMP Meeting by Qwest's SME. Qwest's SME will conduct a walk through of the response.	Presented	Qwest Response

Rev D2 – 10/01/01
Revised at CMP Re-design Meeting 10/03/01
Interim Effective 10/03/01

Work	Flow Step	Description	Status Phase	Milestone
	Monthly	Participating CLECs will be provided the opportunity discuss, clarify and comment on Qwest's Response. • Based on discussions, Qwest's Response can be either: 1. Accepted by the CLECs (Go to 6, Qwest Response Accepted) 2. Rejected by the CLECs and escalated, or deferred (Go to 5B, Qwest Response Not Accepted) 3. Additional revisions required (Go to 5A, Qwest Response Requires Revisions)		Presented
5A	Qwest Response Requires Revision	• Based on the comments received from the Monthly Meeting, Qwest's SME will revise Qwest's draft response and issue a formal response at the next monthly CMP meeting.	Presented	
5B	Qwest Response (Not Accepted)	• If the CLECs do not accept Qwest's response, they can elect to escalate the CR in accordance with agreed Escalation Procedures. • CLECs may not accept Qwest's response, but do not intend to escalate at the present time and would like to defer any action on the CR for a period of time.	Declined	
5C	CR Dispute Escalated	• Refer to current procedure on the WEB URL http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/whatiscmp.html	Escalated	
5D	CR Dispute Resolved	• Refer to current procedure on the WEB URL http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/whatiscmp.html		Resolved
6	Qwest Response Accepted	• If Qwest's response is accepted by the participating CLEC, the following actions could be taken 1. Response answered CR and no further action is required (Go to 10 CLEC Test & Acceptance) 2. Response provided an implementation plan for a product or process to be developed (Go to 7 Product/Process Change Performed). 3. Qwest Denied CLEC CR and no further action is required by CLEC.	CLEC Test Development Declined/Deferred	Qwest Response Accepted
7	Production/ Process Change Performed	• Qwest puts Qwest's recommended implementation plan for a product, or process change/revision/development into production. • As required, CLEC input is provided during development stage.	Development	Qwest Response Accepted
8	Announce Date of Implementation	• Qwest will advise CLEC when revised/new product, or process will be implemented. • See Qwest proposed notification schedule.	Development	CLEC Notified
9	Change Placed into Production	• Qwest's revised/new product or process change was placed into production (implemented by Qwest).	CLEC Test	Test Ready
10	CLEC Test & Acceptance Phase	• For a period of time after Qwest's revised/new product or process was placed into production, CLECs will have the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of Qwest's revised/new product, or process. • The CLECs will provide feed back and continual process improvement will be maintained.	CLEC Test	
11	Change Request Closed (if accepted)	The CR will be closed in one of the following instances: • Qwest's response was accepted by the CLECs, no further action was required and there was no need to conduct a Test and Acceptance phase. • After the CLEC Test & Acceptance Phase, the CLECs believe no further action is required. • No further action has taken place for (TBD time period) on a deferred CR.	Completion	CR Closed

Proposed – CMP CR Work Flow for OSS Interfaces

Work	Flow Step	Description	Status Phase	Milestone
1	CLEC Request (CR Submitted)	• CLEC e-mails completed CR Form to Qwest's CMP Manager • Qwest's CMP Manager reviews CR for completeness, assigns a CR Number and inputs CR into CMP Database. • Qwest CMP Manager forwards CR to CMP Group Manager.	Submission	CR Received
1A	Qwest Originated Change Request	• On CLEC impacting system changes, Qwest will initiate an internal CR. • Qwest initiated CRs will be presented at the Monthly CMP (Go to 3 Presentation of Candidate CR).	Presentation	Monthly CMP Meeting
2	Qwest Determines Acceptance of CR	• On a monthly basis, Qwest's IT Stakeholders review the recently received CLEC CRs and evaluate whether Qwest can implement the CR. • If the CR cannot be implemented by Qwest, Qwest will respond to the CLEC and present reasons at the Monthly CMP (Go to 2A Not Accepted by Qwest). • If the CR can be implemented by Qwest, Qwest will evaluate the CR and provide the following 1. Determine how the CR can be implemented and identify options, 2. Identify the preliminary Level of Effort (S, M, L, XL) required to implement the CR, and 3. Present the position at the next Monthly CMP • As required, Qwest will conduct an Alignment/Clarification meeting with the submitting CLEC to clarify and understand CR requirements.	Clarification	Preliminary Assessment Meeting
2A	Not Accepted by Qwest	• After review of the CR by Qwest, Qwest may determine that it cannot implement the CR. • If the CLECs do not accept Qwest's response, they can elect to escalate the CR in accordance with agreed Escalation Procedures. • CLECs may not accept Qwest's response, but do not intend to escalate at the present time and would like to defer any action on the CR for a period of time.	Declined	Monthly CMP Meeting
2B	CR Dispute	• Refer to current procedure on the WEB URL http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/whatiscmp.html	Escalated	
2C	CR Dispute Resolved	• Refer to current procedure on the WEB URL http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/whatiscmp.html	Clarification or Declined	Resolved
3	Presentation of Candidate CRs	• CLECs will provide an overview of their respective CRs and Qwest will present its Position on the CRs. • Qwest will provide an overview of the Qwest originated CRs. • CRs that Qwest has Declined will be handled in accordance with 2A. • CRs will be placed on the list of CRs to be prioritized at the Quarterly CMP Meeting. • On a Quarterly basis, Qwest will provide a twelve (12) month view of Qwest's systems' development plan.	Presentation	Monthly CMP Meeting
4	CLECs to Vote on CR Prioritization	• Accepted CLEC CRs and Qwest originated CRs will be prioritized by participating in accordance with the agreed Prioritization Guideline per major release. • The list of Candidate CRs to be prioritized will be reviewed at the associated CMP Meeting. • Qwest will develop a voting form for the CLECs to prioritize each CR.	Prioritization	Quarterly Prioritization

Rev G2 – 10/01/01

Note: For Discussion Purposes Only

		• CLECs will e-mail their response to Qwest's CMP Manager for ranking all CLEC prioritization. • Qwest's CMP Manager will rank all CLEC prioritization and provide a consolidated spreadsheet to be reviewed by the CLEC community at an adhoc meeting.		
5	Assessment of CR Priority List "cut-off"	• Based on the prioritization ranking, Qwest will evaluate the list of CRs and determine based on the preliminary Level of Effort for each CR and Qwest's resources, the list of CRs that could be worked into the next major System Release (Baseline Candidate). • Qwest will identify potential packaging options and present to the CLEC community at the next CMP Meeting, or at an adhoc meeting. • CLEC's will be provided the opportunity to adjust the list of Baseline Candidates based on the various packaging options provided by Qwest. Voting/Reprioritization process to be determined. • On CLEC originated CRs, CLECs may elect to defer or withdraw CRs from the selected CR Baseline Candidates.	Prioritization	Resource Loaded Evaluation
6	CR List Identified for Next Release	• Based on the outcome of the final Voting/Reprioritization of the Baseline Candidates, the List of CR Baseline Candidates will be developed and submitted to Qwest's IT Department for project implementation.	Prioritization	Selected CR Baseline Candidates
6A	Unselected CRs	• CRs that did not make the list of CR Baseline Candidates will be returned to the pool of CRs that are available for prioritization on the next System Release.	Prioritization	Quarterly Prioritization
7	Requirements & Design	• Qwest will begin development of a business case, systems requirements and develop a more detailed level of effort for each of the CR Baseline Candidates. • Based on Qwest's business case development and Level of Effort, Qwest will identify the CR Baseline Candidates that can be committed to the development of the System Release.	Development	Final CR Commitment List
7A	Uncommitted CRs	• Qwest will notify the CLECs of the CR Baseline Candidates that were not able to be committed to the System Release. • CRs that could not be committed to the Systems Release will be on the list of CR Baseline Candidates for the next System Release.	Development	Final CR Commitment List
8	Programming	• Qwest will implement all programming requirements for implementation of the System Release. • Requisite notifications per CMP Procedures (under development with Redesign). – This will include the Stand Alone Test Environment for EDI Interface releases.	Development	
9	System Release for Production	• When Qwest has completed development of the System Release in accordance with CMP Procedures (under development with redesign), Qwest will release the System Release into production for use by the CLECs.	CLEC Test	Implementation
10	CLEC Evaluation	• For a period of time after Qwest's release of the System Release into production, CLECs will be allowed to provide feedback on the System's Release functionality to meet the requirements of the applicable CRs. • Qwest's standard development guidelines covering modifications after System Release will be followed. • As required, dot releases will be initiated and/or minor modifications to the System Release will be made.	CLEC Test	
11	CLEC Acceptance of Change	• If the System Release meets the functionality requirements of the CRs and a reasonable evaluation period has occurred, then, with concurrence of the CLEC Community, the CR(s) can be closed.	Completion	CR Closed

Note: For Discussion Purposes Only

WRITTEN SUMMARY REGARDING QWEST'S PROPOSED PROCESS FOR QWEST CHANGES TO PRODUCT, PROCESS, AND TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION

SUBMITTED TO CMP & CMP RE-DESIGN TEAM

BY CMP PARTICIPANTS ALLEGIANCE, AT&T, COVAD, ESCHELON, INTEGRA, SPRINT, AND WORLDCOM

September 25, 2001

Allegiance, AT&T, Covad, Eschelon, Integra, Sprint, and WorldCom (the "joining CLECs") submit this Summary to the CMP and CMP Re-Design Team for consideration and in preparation for additional discussions of changes to Qwest's proposed process for Qwest changes to product, process, and technical documentation and publications. At the September 19th Change Management Process ("CMP") meeting, Qwest reviewed with Competitive Local Exchange Carriers ("CLECs") a presentation relating to its proposed process for changes to its documentation. At the meeting, Qwest was asked to temporarily stop its unapproved activities until a process was established that reflected CLEC comments. Qwest was also asked, when re-commencing with an established process, (i) to start over with the changes made to date to ensure that changes are properly submitted to CMP, (ii) that all changes (including those already discussed on calls) be highlighted (in green) in documentation, (iii) that proper procedures be applied to the communications, and (iv) that technical publications and other documentation be included in the process (in addition to the Product Catalog). We believe that Qwest had agreed to this approach and would focus on creating an interim process to meet CLEC needs. On September 24th, however, Qwest distributed a mailout[1] in which it scheduled a meeting to discuss this issue in October and said: "In the meantime, Qwest will continue to publish documents ***using the current processes in place***" (emphasis added). The fact is that there is no "current process." Qwest made a proposal and CLECs want it improved before it is implemented. Qwest should reconsider its statement, stop the approach that it has implemented on its own, and create an interim process collaboratively with CLECs before proceeding with changes to the Product Catalog, technical publications, or other documentation. Qwest's current approach is inconsistent with the Stipulation that Qwest entered into in several states in the 271 workshops (the "Stipulation").[2] For example, as

[1] Despite discussion of this issue in the September 19th CMP meeting, the mailout was not distributed to the entire CMP distribution list.

[2] WorldCom provided the Stipulation to the other participants of the CMP Re-Design Team during the September 5-6, 2001, Re-Design session. The Stipulation provides: "Qwest agrees that, within 45 days of closing a workshop, it will update its technical publications, product catalog (also known as the IRRG), and product documentation for CLECs to reflect the agreements made in the workshop and to make Qwest's documentation consistent with its SGAT. Qwest will then submit the updated technical publications, product catalog, and product documentation to the Change Management Process (CICMP). When Qwest submits the documents to CICMP, Qwest will file a notice in this proceeding indicating that the documents have been updated and how to obtain copies. Qwest will take affirmative action following the close of a workshop to communicate to appropriate personnel and to implement the agreements made in such

discussed below, Qwest has suggested (and is, in effect, maintaining) a self-imposed 30-day deadline for receipt of CLEC input that is not contained in the Stipulation. Because Qwest's proposed process is inadequate for all of the reasons discussed in this Summary, the joining CLECs will not agree to any particular review period at least until an effective process is collaboratively developed.

Insufficient Notice and Documentation

On July 18, 2001, Bill Campbell of Qwest reviewed a 7-page bullet-point presentation with CLECs at the CMP meeting on the topic of changes to Qwest's Product Catalog and technical publications. The presentation was not listed on the agenda, and the written presentation was not included in the CMP Distribution Package that was distributed before the meeting. Other than the high level, 7-page presentation, Qwest provided no methods and procedures or other written documentation for the proposed process. CLECs did not have adequate notice of the subject or content of the September 19th CMP discussion. Such notice is useful for ensuring that the proper CLEC representatives are present and have had an opportunity to prepare for the discussion. At the meeting, Mr. Campbell asked for CLEC opinions about the best manner in which to proceed with communicating information about changes in the Qwest Product Catalog and technical publications. Although CLECs did not have an opportunity to prepare to comment, they attempted to address Mr. Campbell's request. It has become clear since then, however, that CLECs were given insufficient information to realize the context and meaning of the changes and the request for input, the volume of information to be distributed, and the effect of the comments they were asked to provide at that meeting. Mr. Campbell's presentation was at a high level. Rather than communicate the specifics of a process to be implemented, Mr. Campbell conveyed a general message that Qwest would work with CLECs to produce a consensus-driven process. Such a process has not developed.

Problems With Implementation of Current Approach and Proposal

After the July 18th CMP meeting, Qwest proceeded with conference calls during which Qwest has described changes to its Product Catalog. There are no conference calls to discuss changes to technical publications. Although the conference calls to discuss the Product Catalog were described as informational (to describe changes being made), some notices for the calls have indicated that CLECs must comment on the proposed changes within 30 days. In the meantime, the changes appear to go into effect. If there is a process for addressing and incorporating CLEC comments (other than to simply receive such comments), it was not communicated to, or documented for, CLECs.

The current approach and Qwest's proposal are insufficiently organized and coordinated to handle the sheer volume of changes that Qwest is attempting to address in an insufficient amount of time. To illustrate the problem, one of Qwest's recent mailout notices is attached as Exhibit A. The notice indicates that a technical publication has

---

workshop. Qwest acknowledges that any commission order or report recommending that Qwest meet a checklist item will be conditioned on Qwest's compliance with this commitment."

been updated. No information is given in the notice regarding the nature of the "updates." The notice refers CLECs to Qwest's wholesale web site, where the technical publication is posted. The posted document is 288 pages long and very technical in nature. There is no highlighting or other indication anywhere in the document as to what "updates" have been made. The source or reason for any changes is not given.[3] Instead, the mailout states that "these updates reflect current practice." This statement suggests that substantive changes to practices that CLECs have been accustomed to using have not been made, when that may not be the case. This 288-page document is only one of those to which CLECs are supposed to respond within overlapping 30-day time periods. When CLECs are being inundated with such information, in apparent random order, this is insufficient time. This is particularly true because CLECs need to not only understand the changes but train their employees on them as well.

The mailout notice in Exhibit A also provides insufficient notice as to the process, the need for comments, and the effect of any failure to comment. The notices states the "Your comments . . . are very important to QWEST prior to the issuance of any tariff actions." It is unclear what this means. The statement implies, however, that the next step is the filing of a tariff by Qwest, rather than submission of the issues to CMP. Qwest "reserves the right to revise this document for any reason, including but not limited to, conformity with standards by various governmental or regulatory agencies; utilization of advances in the state of the technical arts; or to reflect changes in the design of equipment, techniques, or procedures described in the technical publication." Again, there is no indication that Qwest will submit such revisions to CMP, and the language implies the changes will be unilateral. The mailout goes on to state that "there are additional changes that will be forthcoming as a result of ongoing regulatory activities." The mailout also states that, with respect to future changes, "wholesale customers will receive written notification announcing the upcoming change." Because it states that the changes will simply be "announced," rather than submitted to CMP for consideration, the language again suggests that the changes are unilateral changes that will be made and distributed as is. In addition, the mailout states: "Effective Date: Immediately." Together, these statements, without further explanation, discourage CLEC feedback, because it appears that changes will be made to the documentation anyway with little or no opportunity for CLECs to affect the result. Consistent with that impression, the mailout states that "Customers ***will*** be able to receive a ***final*** published technical publication after November 12, 2001" (emphasis added). This date is only seven days after the deadline for CLECs to submit comments on the updates. The time frame does not suggest any substantive review or serious consideration of CLEC comments

[3] As Qwest knows, the request to provide a source and explanation was made before any of the recent changes were made and related conference calls held. AT&T and WorldCom point out that Qwest agreed to provide this information in 271 workshops in Washington in April and July. Nonetheless, Qwest has proceeded with distributing product and technical publication changes without this promised information. The work that now needs to be re-done, which will cause delay and unnecessary resource expenditures for all, could have been avoided if Qwest had provided the agreed upon information as changes were being distributed, and worked with CLECs **in advance** to establish a collaboratively agreed upon process for making and distributing changes to documentation. Given that Qwest committed to providing this information and establishing a process for documentation changes approximately five months ago, there is no reason that an effective process could not have been fully developed earlier.

submitted in the intervening seven days. CLECs cannot obtain changes to Qwest's documentation by sending a notice to the CMP distribution list and "announcing" a change, to be effective within 45 days, even when the change has been ordered by a regulatory agency. The CMP has processes in place to deal with regulatory orders, and the Re-Design Team is also reviewing and re-designing those processes. Qwest's notice does not even state that the changes that are the subject of the mailout are required by a regulatory order, and it does not cite to any other source for the particular changes.[4] Even assuming the changes were required by a regulatory order, the CMP deals with the procedures for making such changes. The process outlined by Qwest in its mailout is completely inadequate, as well as inconsistent with the Stipulation's requirement to submit such changes to CMP.

The mailout in Exhibit A is a typical example of the pressures that Qwest places on CLECs because of the timeline that Qwest has imposed on itself (for obtaining 271 approval). In doing so, the process to change documentation is not truly collaborative. When Qwest issues a product notification today, Qwest requires CLECs to adhere to the process within 30 or 45 days, or less, but it provides no documented process for obtaining and incorporating input from CLECs. There is no guarantee from Qwest that it will take into account CLEC input before product or process rollout. As an example, WorldCom submitted comments by email regarding Qwest Line Splitting Product Notification PDRN051801-2 on July 12, 2001. More than two months have passed, and Qwest has not responded. Meantime, the product changes appear to have gone into effect without consideration or modification in light of WorldCom's comments.

In addition to comments on the notices themselves, CLECs have contacted Qwest with feedback on Qwest's approach to documentation of the change process. Qwest indicated, at a September 19th CMP meeting, that some of the CLEC representatives not present have provided positive feedback about the Product Catalog conference calls. Eschelon indicates that some of its representatives have indicated that they have learned new information on the calls, and they appreciate the information. The standard, however, should not be whether any information at all was gained (*i.e.*, something is better than nothing). An effective process is needed not only for communicating information but also for ensuring that the information is complete and reaches all interested parties with adequate notice and for addressing and incorporating feedback about the proposed changes.

Eschelon has contacted Mr. Campbell directly (as well as notified the CMP Director) about its concerns about the manner in which the changes have been addressed. After an initial conversation, Eschelon followed up with written concerns, to which Mr. Campbell did not respond. Eschelon had to request a schedule of conference calls, so that it could plan which of its employees needed to participate in each call. Only after some effort did Qwest provide such a schedule. Even then, Qwest sometimes changes the agenda for a particular call, so that the correct CLEC personnel are not on the calls. Notice is too short to react appropriately to such changes. Eschelon also pointed out that the mailouts regarding the conference calls are buried in numerous mailouts about other

[4] *See* footnote 3.

issues, so that it is difficult to identify them. The Product Catalog calls appear to be in random order, and it is unclear how many total calls or changes are anticipated. Generally, only one call at one time and date, which is unilaterally scheduled by Qwest, is scheduled for each subject matter. If a CLEC representative is not available, that person does not have another opportunity to participate. Qwest does not provide detailed agendas or identify the Qwest participants and their roles before the calls, nor does it routinely provide minutes after the calls. To date, Qwest has not even highlighted the changes in the documentation, so CLECs cannot readily discern which of the information provided has changed. Eschelon has had difficulty opening some of the documentation provided. Qwest indicated that it was an Eschelon-specific problem, but Eschelon's Service Manager at Qwest was also unable to access the information before the applicable conference call. If the documentation was provided earlier, such issues could be addressed before the calls. Eschelon asked Qwest to provide a firm schedule for all upcoming conference calls to discuss changes to documentation and to publish and circulate the documentation for the calls at least two weeks before each call.

At recent CMP Re-Design Meetings, Allegiance, AT&T, Covad, Eschelon, Integra, Sprint, and WorldCom asked about the process being used by Qwest for changes to documentation, such as the Product Catalog and technical publications. CLECs pointed out that the need for an improved process was urgent, because many of the conference calls and notices relating to such changes are already being distributed, without Qwest-CLEC consensus on the appropriate process to address such changes. Qwest said that Susie Bliss of Qwest would provide a presentation, at the September 19th CMP meeting, regarding Qwest's proposed interim process (to be used until the CMP Re-Design Team can develop a long-term process). Although Qwest knew of this plan before the Distribution Package for the September 19th meeting was distributed to CLECs, Qwest did not include the presentation on the written agenda. Qwest handled it as a "walk on" item, which means there is no notice in the written materials that the issue will be addressed at the meeting. Although CLEC concerns had been raised before the September 19th meeting, the "proposed" process described by Qwest was simply the one already in place (with the exception of a plan to begin highlighting the changes in green in the documentation, on a going forward basis).

<u>The Qwest 4-Page "CLEC Documentation Proposed Beta Test" Presentation (September 19, 2001, CMP Walk-On Item)</u>

At the September 19th CMP meeting, Susie Bliss of Qwest reviewed a 4-page, high level presentation with CLECs. The 4-page document was not included in the Distribution Package in advance of the meeting but was sent separately by email to the CMP distribution list on the day of the meeting. The subject line of the email referred to the document as a "handout" with no indication of the subject matter of the handout. Other than the 4-page presentation, Qwest provided no methods and procedures or other written documentation for the proposed process.

At the September 19th CMP meeting, Qwest asked whether it was meeting the needs of CLECs. Eschelon said that it was not. At the meeting, Eschelon then listed the

problems it identified in the Qwest presentation. AT&T and Allegiance indicated that they agreed with Eschelon's concerns. No CLEC at the meeting took the position that Qwest's approach and proposal are adequate without revision. Since then, all of the CLECs joining in this Summary have indicated that they also agree with the concerns raised at the meeting. These problems are (in order of the 4-page presentation):

Title ("CLEC Documentation Proposed Beta Test"): If the title of the document and the subject line of the email distributing it had referred to Proposed Process for Changes to documentation such as Product Catalog and Technical Publications, CLECs would have had better notice of the subject matter of the discussion. More importantly, it is inaccurate to describe this process as a "Beta Test." No consensus has been reached on a process to be tested. At least some CLECs have recognized that an ***interim*** process may be needed until the CMP Re-Design Team has time to develop a long-term process for these changes. The need for an interim process is due to the volume of changes that are already being distributed and the problems encountered to date. Although an interim process, if agreed upon, could be viewed as a test for a long-term process (in the sense that successful elements could be adopted on a long-term basis), the process described by Qwest on September 19th was too flawed and contained insufficient detail to serve as such a test.

"Proposed" process: Qwest refers to its "Beta Test" as a "Proposed" process. Qwest has unilaterally implemented the process, however, without waiting for adoption of its "proposal." Changes are going into effect even before comment, much less approval, is obtained. The Stipulation provides that Qwest will "submit" the documents to CMP. The Stipulation is not limited to "notice" of changes to documentation, and it requires submission to CMP. This makes sense, given the manner in which this issue has developed. Qwest's initial draft SGATs included language essentially incorporating, by reference, outside documents (such as the Product Catalog and technical publications). CLECs objected that Qwest should not be able to incorporate in a contract documents that Qwest could unilaterally change. By making such changes, Qwest could, in effect, unilaterally change the terms of the interconnection agreement. Submission of the proposed changes to CMP was seen as a compromise between attaching all such documents (or addressing all such terms) and allowing Qwest to simply refer to them. It was viewed as at least some check on Qwest's ability to change contract terms without CLEC agreement. Thus, the Stipulation requires Qwest to "submit" changes to documentation to CMP. If merely notifying CLECs of a change, without any approval process, can meet that Stipulation, then the underlying need to prevent unilateral changes to contract terms has not been met. Therefore, the Stipulation must require more. ***Qwest must submit changes to the CMP, rather than simply using the CMP distribution list as a mailing list for virtually unilateral changes.***

"One size fits all" and "Beta Test" versus "Interim" Process: Ms. Bliss said that Qwest was attempting to develop a "one size fits all" approach. This should not mean that one process should be used for all types of changes (and Ms. Bliss does not appear to have meant this). There may be differences in the appropriate process, depending on whether a Change Request is initiated by CLECs, Qwest, industry

organizations, regulatory bodies, *etc.* If an ***interim*** process is established for changes to documentation, it will be established to recognize a current, unusually high volume and pressing need. Such an interim process should be used ***only*** for regulatory-initiated changes, which are the changes currently driving the request for an interim process. Qwest should identify the source of the regulatory-initiated changes,[5] and a process should be established in the event that CLEC(s) disagree that the change has been ordered by a regulatory agency. By allowing CLEC input on the interpretation of the regulatory order before the change is made, all parties will avoid delays in implementing the appropriate regulatory order. If Qwest is initiating other changes to its documentation, those changes should be submitted as written Change Requests, just as CLEC-initiated Change Requests must be submitted to CMP. Although it is likely that regulatory changes will also, ultimately, be submitted as Change Requests under the process being developed the CMP Re-Design Team, CLECs have been willing to discuss an interim process to recognize the current volume of changes and regulatory orders stemming from pending 271 proceedings. Although CLECs have been willing to discuss accommodating Qwest's desire to make such changes expeditiously to assist in gaining 271 approval, these changes cannot be made without proper safeguards and at the expense of CLECs.

Purpose of the September 19th discussion/Technical Publications: Ms. Bliss indicated that the process described in her presentation addressed changes to the Qwest product documentation but not technical publications. CLECs rely upon technical publications to validate appropriate ordering requirements required by Qwest. As such, a collaborative process is needed for technical publications as well. As discussed above, the approach being used for technical publications today (*see* Exhibit A) is unworkable. A collaboratively developed process is needed to avoid such problems.

Clarity as to what is changed: To date, the discussions of changes to the Product Catalog have been confusing because it is unclear what has changed and the source of the change. Ms. Bliss said that Qwest would begin to show changes to the language in documentation by adding green highlighting to the documents where changes have been made. Qwest was asked to go back to the changes previously addressed in conference calls that have already occurred and provide those changes in green as well and then have new discussions when it is clear what has changed. Qwest should not only highlight the change in green but also reference the source of the change.[6]

Posting of changes on the Qwest web site: Qwest refers, in the first bullet on page 3 of the presentation, simply to a web posting to communicate changes to the existing Product Catalog. Because the changes are not being distributed on any kind of regular schedule, CLECs have no notice as to when to look on the web site for such postings. Better scheduling, with more advance notice of a complete, firm schedule of definite subjects, would reduce some of this uncertainty. Even then, adequate email notice, with proper naming conventions to alert CLECs to the subject matter, may be required to ensure that CLECs are aware of relevant communications.

---

[5] *See* footnote 3.
[6] *See* footnote 3.

Commitment to presentation and discussion in CMP meetings (or, when necessary, on conference calls): The presentation indicates, on page 3, that "Changes to existing Product or Process documentation (known as the Product Catalogues - PCATs) to be developed and posted to the Qwest Change Management web site for 30 day review by CLECs." The presentation does not mention either the ongoing conference calls that are currently being held to disseminate information or routine submission to the CMP process. Instead, the presentation states only that "significant changes will be proposed through the CMP process." The document does not define "significant," nor does it indicate who decides whether the issues are significant enough for submission to CMP. Qwest entered into a Stipulation in several states in which it agreed to the following: "Qwest will then submit the updated technical publications, product catalog, and product documentation to the Change Management Process (CICMP)." The stipulation is not limited to "significant" changes. To date, such changes have not been submitted to CICMP (now "CMP"). Using the CMP email distribution list to provide notices or announce calls does not constitute submitting changes to CMP. When a CLEC requires a change, it must submit a Change Request. ***Qwest needs to follow the CMP process as well.*** If expedited treatment is needed because of regulatory requirements, a process should be established to deal with that.

Qwest had indicated that the number of issues and amount of time needed to discuss the proposed changes were too great for handling in 4-hour CMP meetings. Therefore, CLECs had requested such calls (assuming the calls would be properly noticed and managed), in addition to the written materials, to encourage discussion and understanding of changes. CLECs did not understand, at the time, that Qwest intended that the calls would replace submission of changes to CMP. Given the number of separate calls and difficulties to date in managing them, the calls have not worked as a means for properly addressing changes. The conference calls, as managed to date, provide inadequate notice of changes that have been unilaterally made.

The changes should be dealt with in CMP. Now that the parties have agreed to expand the CMP process to 2-day monthly sessions, adequate time should be available for doing so. At the meetings, Qwest should present the requested changes (using Change Requests), and genuine discussion should occur of the issues and any needed next steps. If a process is established to deal with some issues in separate conference calls, any such calls should be better managed. This includes establishing intervals for notice and other steps; providing adequate, meaningful notice of any agenda items or calls (such as sending the notice sufficiently in advance of the call to allow review of the materials, using clear naming conventions in the email to indicate the call's subject matter, and not changing the agenda shortly before the call); providing a firm schedule of any upcoming calls so that CLECs have a bigger picture view and not merely separate notices of a call now and then; providing prior notice of the agenda and the names and titles of Qwest attendees; including appropriate subject matter personnel in any discussions; providing more than one time to receive information; providing working access to documentation with sufficient time to correct problems; and maintaining and distributing minutes/documentation of the discussions. If conference calls will be used, written documentation of these kinds of procedures should be provided.

CLEC review and feedback: Qwest's written documentation of its proposed process for CLEC review and feedback of changes is contained in four bullet points on page 3 of the presentation. As brief as it is, Qwest's description raises several issues:

30-day limit on review: In the first bullet point on page 3 of the presentation, Qwest indicates that CLECs will have 30 days for review of changes to the Product Catalog, after posting of those changes on the web site. Ms. Bliss added orally that, after 30 days, Qwest would be moving the changes to "final" status. Qwest provides no basis for the 30-day limitation. Qwest was allowed a longer period of time to physically prepare its updates to the technical publications than Qwest is providing to CLECs to substantively review them. In addition to all of the time during which Qwest has negotiated and prepared for changes to date, the Stipulation provided that Qwest would receive 45 days to "update its technical publications, product catalog (also known as the IRRG), and product documentation for CLECs to reflect the agreements made in the workshop and to make Qwest's documentation consistent with the SGAT." ***After*** that 45-day period, per the Stipulation, "Qwest will ***then*** submit the updated technical publications, product catalog, and product documentation to the Change Management Process (CICMP)" (emphasis added). The only time limitation in the stipulation applies to Qwest and its preparation of the updates. There is no basis in the Stipulation for limiting CLECs to 30 days for review of the voluminous information that is being provided to CLECs in a piecemeal fashion today. CLECs recognize that they may benefit from many of these changes, and they do want to establish an effective process to make those changes as quickly as possible. The process established by Qwest, however, does not do so effectively or with adequate opportunity for CLEC input.

Form of CLEC comments and Role of CDOC: In the second bullet point on page 3 of the presentation, Qwest states that: "CLEC comments/questions will be forwarded via email through the Qwest Project Management Organization (PMO) to a CLEC Documentation Oversight Committee (CDOC) for review and determination of next steps." Although discussions are or should occur during the CMP meeting (or, when necessary, separate conference calls), this language anticipates written comments. If comments are made during a conversation and noted in minutes, it is unclear why an additional email submission is necessary. Also, Qwest provided no definition or documentation relating to the CDOC, its role, its membership, its processes and procedures, any criteria it would use for consideration of comments and "determination of next steps," notification of decisions, or any other information. It also appears from this language that Qwest anticipates being the sole decision maker with respect to CLEC comments and "determination of next steps." The presentation contains no standards for decision making and no procedures for voting.

"Minor" modifications: In the third bullet point on page 3 of the presentation, Qwest states that "Minor modifications/corrections will be completed within 15

days of the end of the 30 day comment cycle." As with the term "significant" in the next bullet point, Qwest provides no definition or criteria relating to its use of "minor," nor does it state who decides whether a change is minor or how it will be implemented. An expedite process could be used for minor changes, but it should contemplate some presentation to CLECs and concurrence that the change is minor and should be made.

Conclusion

Qwest should work with CLECs to develop a workable, consensus-driven process for submitting changes to documentation, including the product, processes, and technical documentation, to CMP. The CLECs joining in this Summary are willing to discuss an interim process to assist with handling regulatory-initiated Change Requests, but the process needs to consist of genuine submission to CMP and address the concerns raised by CLECs to date. Until such a process is developed, the joining CLECs expect Qwest to honor its commitment to cease the current unworkable process. Continuing along this process will simply create more work that will need to be re-done. Qwest needs to implement new procedures for changes that it has announced in the past few weeks, as well as for changes on a going forward basis. The joining CLECs have already devoted substantial resources to assisting Qwest in starting to re-design CMP, and they are committed to continuing to do so. But, responsiveness from Qwest is needed to ensure that a mutually satisfactory and beneficial process can be developed. Qwest can begin by ceasing its current approach to these changes, on a temporary basis, while an established, improved process is developed.

EXHIBIT A

-----Original Message-----
From: mailouts@qwest.com [SMTP:mailouts@qwest.com]
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2001 11:57 AM
To: [...]
Subject: Tech Pub: Update to #77386-G Interconnections & Collocation: Effective 9-21-01 Interim

4,A <http://www.geocities.com/lchuck78/logo.gif>

September 21, 2001

Qwest All Notices
Eschelon Telecom Inc.
730 Second Ave S #1200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
qwest.all.notices@eschelon.com

To: Qwest All Notices

Announcement Date: September 21, 2001
Effective Date: Immediately
Document Number: TECH.09.20.01.F.77386-G
Notification Category: Product, Network
Target Audience: CLEC, Reseller, IXC, Wireless
Subject: Update to Technical Publication
QWEST has completed a "Final Draft" of Technical Publication 77386, Issue, and titled "Interconnections and Collocation For Transport and Switched Unbundled Network Elements and Finished Services." Your comments to this "Final Draft" technical publication are very important to QWEST prior to the issuance of any tariff actions. You may view the technical publication on the Internet at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/notices/techPub.html>. We recommend using Adobe Acrobat version 4.0 or newer. Click on PUB 77386.

QWEST requests that comments or correspondence on this technical publication be **completed prior to, November 5, 2001** and be directed to the following:

QWEST Corporation

Attn: Jeff Farra
700 W. Mineral Ave. MN-G14.27
Littleton, CO 80120

(303) 707-7117 voice or (303) 707-9498 fax

QWEST reserves the right to revise this document for any reason, including but not limited to, conformity with standards promulgated by various

governmental or regulatory agencies; utilization of advances in the state of the technical arts; or to reflect changes in the design of equipment, techniques, or procedures described in the technical publication.

Customers will be able to receive a final published technical publication after November 12, 2001 from QWEST by going to URL http://www.qwest.com/techpub <http://uswest.com/techpub> and downloading the PDF file.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this notice please contact your Qwest Service Manager, Pat Levene on 6126636265 or your may call Jeff Farra on 303-707-7117. Qwest appreciates your business and we look forward to our continued relationship.

Sincerely,

Qwest
[...]

Note: While these updates reflect current practice, it is important to note that there are additional changes that will be forthcoming as a result of ongoing regulatory activities e.g., collaborative workshops and state commission orders. As these changes are defined and implementation dates are determined, notice of additional updates will be provided accordinlgy.

The Qwest Wholesale Web Site provides a comprehensive catalog of detailed information on Qwest products and services including specific descriptions on doing business with Qwest. All information provided on the site describes current activities and process. Prior to any modifications to existing activities o! r processes described on the web site, wholesale customers will receive written notification announcing the upcoming change.
1232918/67817.150

CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP) FOR LOCAL SERVICES ~~ORDERING AND PROVISIONING~~

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 4

TYPES OF CHANGE 7

I. Type 1 (Production Support) Change 7

II. Type 2 (Regulatory) Change 8

III. Type 3 (Industry Guideline) Change 8

IV. Type 4 (Provider Originated) Change 9

V. Type 5 (~~Customer~~CLEC Originated) Change 9

VI. Tracking Change Requests 10

CHANGE REQUEST INITIATION PROCESS 11

I. ~~Customer~~CLEC Originated Requests 11

II. Provider Originated Requests 13

INTRODUCTION OF A NEW INTERFACE 14

I. Release Planning 14

II. ~~Customer~~CLEC Responses/Comments 14

III. Provider Responses/Comments 15

IV. Final Release Announcement 15

CHANGE TO EXISTING INTERFACES 16

I. Interface Change Process 16

II. Versioning of Type 1 Changes 16

III. Versioning of Type 2 Changes 16

IV. Versioning of Type 3 Changes 17

V. Versioning of Type 4 and Type 5 Changes 17

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

RETIREMENT OF EXISTING INTERFACES *18*

I. Initial Retirement Plans *18*

II. Final Retirement Notice 18

MANAGING THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS 19

I. Change Management POC 19

II. Purpose of Change Management POC 19

III. Change Management POC List Creation 19

IV. Formal Method of Communication 20

V. Governing Body 20

MEETINGS 22

I. Agenda Items for Change Management Meeting 23

II. Change Management Meeting Action Log and Change Request Status 25

III. Meeting Minutes for Change Management Meeting 25

IV. Provider Change Management Process Web Site 26

REQUIREMENTS REVIEW *28*

I. Draft Interface Release Requirements *28*

II. Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements *28*

III. Walk Through of Draft Interface Release Requirements *29*

IV. ~~Customer~~CLEC's Comments on Draft Interface Release Requirements *29*

V. Provider Response to Comments *29*

VI. Final Interface Release Requirements *29*

VII. Content of Final Interface Release Requirements 30

PRIORITIZATION *31*

I. Prioritization Review *31*

II. Prioritization Process *31*

III. Voting 32

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

ESCALATION PROCESS 33

I. Guidelines 33

II. Cycle 33

INTERFACE TESTING *36*

I. New Release & Production Support Testing in the ~~Customer~~CLEC Test Environment (CTE) *36*

II. New Release Testing *36*

III. Getting Ready for the New Release Testing *37*

IV. Production Support Testing 37

TRAINING 38

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

DEFINITION OF TERMS ~~41414140~~

GLOSSARY OF TERMS ~~42424241~~

APPENDIX A: CHANGE REQUEST FORM AND CHECKLIST ~~43434342~~

I. Appendix A-1: Change Request Form ~~43434342~~

II. Appendix A-2: Change Request Form Checklist ~~47474746~~

APPENDIX B: CHANGE REQUEST PRIORITIZATION FORM ~~50505049~~

APPENDIX C: CMP PRIORITIZATION PROCESS EXAMPLE ~~51515150~~

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP)
~~FOR LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING AND PROVISIONING~~

~~NEED REFERENCE TO CUSTOMERCLEC/PROVIDER NEGOTIATIONS~~
~~INTRODUCTION [Need to re-address at a later date]~~
~~Action Item #17~~

~~The Change Management Process (CMP) is the a formal method used by customersCompetitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs) and Qwest and a local service providers to initiate, communicate, prioritize, schedule, testcommunicate about and implement changes enhancements changes to Qwestprovider Operational Support Systems (OSS) interfaces which directly or indirectly impact a CLEC. used in connection with resold services and unbundled network elements. Changes include new functionality, enhancements to existing functionality, defect maintenance and introduction/retirement of interfaces, based on Local Service Ordering Guidelines (LSOG).~~

~~The change management process creates a framework for meetings in which changes to the provider's Qwest's OSSs and their business rules may be introduced or discussed. The CLECscustomer's Point Of Contact (POC) may request interface changes for future consideration by submitting a Change Request Form to the provider'sQwest's POC.~~

~~The FCC requires Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers to have processes for management of manual and electronic interfaces relative to order, pre-order, account maintenance, testing and billing. The scope of this document is to define only the processes for change management of manual and electronic interfaces relative to order and pre-order functions.~~

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE ~~[need to readdress at a later date]~~
~~Action Item 17~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

This document defines the processes for change management of oss interfaces, products and processes (including manual) as described below. Cmp provides a means to address changes that support or affect pre-ordering, ordering/provisioning, maintenance/repair and billing capabilities and associated documentation and production support issues for local services provided by clecs to their end users.

The cmp is managed by clec and qwest representatives each having distinct roles and responsibilities. The clecs and qwest will hold regular meetings to exchange information about the status of existing changes, the need for new changes, what changes qwest is proposing, how the process is working, etc. The process also allows for escalation to resolve disputes, if necessary.

Qwest will track changes to oss interfaces, products and processes. The cmp includes the identification of changes and encompasses, as applicable, [requirement definition, design, development, notification, testing, implementation and disposition of changes – revisit list]. Qwest will process any such changes in accordance with the cmp described in this document.

~~manual and electronic interfaces relative to pre-order, and pre-order, provisioning, maintenance/repair, and billing functions. Interface impact is defined as changes to field content or format, or changes in the business rules used to govern field population. This includes national guideline changes, e.g., LSOG, as well as providerQwest specific interface process and system changes. Changes include new functionality, enhancements to existing functionality, introduction/retirement of interfacesprocesses and systems and maintenance activities affecting production defects. Desired changes should be submitted to the appropriate ATIS Forum.~~

~~Theis scope includes any pre-order, order business rules, interface system testing and maintenance that impact ongoing and future technical and operational processes, and changes that alter the relationship in the manner in which the provider Qwest and customer a CLEC do business.~~

~~The CMP provides a means for changes to the provider's OSSs and their business rules. The customer's Point Of Contact (POC) may request interface changes for future consideration by submitting a Change Request Form to the~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

~~provider's POC. These requests may include new functionality or changes to existing functionality.~~

~~The types of changes that will be handled by this process are:~~

- ~~Software changes~~
- ~~System Environment Configuration changes~~
- ~~Changes resulting from new or changed Industry Guidelines / Standards~~
- ~~Product and Services (e.g., new services available via the in-scope interfaces)~~
- ~~Processes (e.g., electronic interfaces and manual processes relative to order and pre-order)~~
- ~~Regulatory~~
- ~~Documentation (e.g., business rules for electronic and manual processes relative to order and pre-order.~~
- ~~Defect resolution~~
- ~~Guidelines for provider-specific change management processes~~

~~The provider~~Qwest ~~will track changes to the OSS interfaces as change requests and assign a tracking number to each change request. The CMP begins with the identification of the change request and encompasses requirement definition, design, development, notification, testing, implementation and decommissioning of the change request.~~

~~The CMP is managed by customer~~CLEC ~~and provider representatives each having distinct roles and responsibilities. The customer~~CLEC ~~and the provider~~Qwest ~~will hold regular meetings to exchange information about the status of existing change requests, the need for new changes, what changes the provider~~Qwest ~~is proposing, how the process is working, etc. The process also allows for escalation to resolve disputes, if necessary.~~

The CMP is dynamic in nature and, as such, is managed through the regularly scheduled meetings ~~and is based on group consensus~~. This document may be revised, through ~~the procedures set forth by~~ the procedures described in section (X) ~~the OBF, as business and/or regulatory conditions dictate.~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Managed Changes
Changes to Existing Interfaces

TYPES OF CHANGE

The change request should fall into one of the following classifications:

I. *Type 1 (Production Support) Change*

A Type 1 change corrects problems discovered in production versions of an OSS~~Application~~ interface. Either ~~the provider~~Qwest or the ~~customer~~CLEC may initiate the change request. Typically, this type of change reflects instances where a technical implementation is faulty or inaccurate such as to cause correctly or properly formatted data to be rejected. Instances where ~~providers~~Qwest or ~~customer~~CLECs misinterpret interface specifications and/or business rules must be addressed on a case-by-case basis. All parties will take all reasonable steps to ensure that any disagreements regarding the interpretation of a new or modified business process are identified and resolved during the change management review of the change request. Type 1 changes will be processed on an expedited basis by means of an emergency release of software/documentation.

Additionally, once a Type 1 change is identified, the change management team (see the Managing The Change Management Process section) must determine the nature and scope of the maintenance. Type 1 changes are categorized in the following manner:

Severity 1: *Production Stopped: Interface Unusable – Interface discrepancy results in totally unusable interface requiring emergency action. ~~Customer~~CLEC Orders/Pre-Orders cannot be submitted or will not be accepted by ~~the provider~~Qwest and manual work-arounds are not feasible. Correction is considered essential to continued operation. ~~The provider~~Qwest and ~~customer~~CLECs should dedicate resources to expedite resolution.*

Acknowledgment Notification = 1 hour

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Status Notification = bi-hourly

Severity 2: *Production Degraded: Interface Affecting - An interface discrepancy that requires a work-around(s) on the part of the ~~customer~~CLEC or ~~the provider~~Qwest. The change is considered critical to continued operation. It does not stop production, but affects key applications.*

Acknowledgment Notification = 4 hours
Status Notification = weekly
Implementation time = 14 - 30 calendar days

Severity 3: *Process Impacted: Pre-order / Order requests can be submitted and will be accepted through normal processes / interfaces. Clarification is considered necessary to ongoing operations.*

Acknowledgment Notification = 7 calendar days
Implementation time = 30 - 60 calendar days

II. Type 2 (Regulatory) Change

A Type 2 change is mandated by regulatory or legal entities, such as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), a state commission/authority, or state and federal courts. Regulatory changes are not voluntary but are requisite to comply with newly passed legislation, regulatory requirements, or court rulings. Either the ~~customer~~CLEC or ~~the provider~~Qwest may initiate the change request.

III. ~~Type 3~~ (Industry Guideline) Change

~~A Type 3 change implements telecommunications~~An ~~-~~Industry ~~G~~guideline Change implements Industry Guidelines~~-~~using a national implementation timeline, if any. Either ~~the provider~~Qwest or the ~~customer~~CLEC may initiate the change request. These guidelines are industry defined by:

Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) Sponsored

- Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF)
- Local Service Ordering and Provisioning Committee (LSOP)
- Telecommunications Industry Forum (TCIF)

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

- Electronic Commerce Inter-exchange Committee (ECIC)
- Electronic Data Interface Committee (EDI)
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI) (Action item#)

IV. ~~Type 4 (Provider Originated) Change~~ Qwest Originated Change

~~A Type 4~~ A Qwest Originated change is originated by ~~the provider~~Qwest does not fall within the changes listed above and is within the scope of CMP~~ and affects interfaces between customers and the provider. These changes may involve system enhancements, manual and/or business processes~~].

V. ~~Type 5 (Customer~~~~CLEC Originated) Change~~ CLEC Originated Change

~~A Type 5~~ A CLEC Originated change is originated by the ~~customer~~CLEC does not fall within the changes listed above and is within the scope of CMP.~~and affects interfaces between customers and the provider. These changes may reflect a business process improvement that the customer~~~~CLEC~~ is seeking to implement and implies a change in the way in which the customer~~~~CLEC~~ wishes to interact with the provider~~Qwest.~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

VI. *Tracking Change Requests [move to CR initiation process]*

The provider Qwest will assign a tracking number to each change request and track changes to each change request. Tracking will be accomplished via a change request log.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

CHANGE REQUEST INITIATION PROCESS

The ~~customer~~~~CLEC or provider~~ change request initiator ~~should~~ will complete a Change Request Form (see Appendix XA) as defined by the instructions on ~~the provider~~Qwest's CMP web site. The Change Request Form ~~should~~ is also ~~be~~ located on ~~the provider~~Qwest's CMP web site.

~~I.Customer~~CLEC Originated Requests –

The ~~customer~~CLEC will submit the Change Request Form to ~~the provider~~ the appropriate Qwest CMP Manager electronically as defined in the CR Form instructions.~~via e-mail~~. ~~The provider~~Qwest will review the submitted change request for completeness. Within two (2) business days of receipt, ~~the provider~~Qwest will either request information to ensure a complete request or will return a tracking number for the change request. This will ~~normally~~ be done via email to the originator. Within ex (x) business days after the CR Tracking number has been assigned, Qwest will contact the CR originator to schedule ~~the provider~~~~Qwest~~ clarification discussions if necessary.

Qwest will provide a response notification to the CLECs within X business days via email and will be posted on the CMP web site. The CR originator may request a conference call before the next scheduled CMP Meeting to discuss the provided response

Change requests that have been assigned a tracking number fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the next prioritization meeting will be included on the spreadsheet of change requests pending initial rating.

Within twenty-one (21) calendar days after the change request is submitted, ~~the provider~~Qwest will provide a preliminary assessment indicating one of the following:

- *The change request is accepted and is a candidate for prioritization (see Prioritization section).*
- *The change request is rejected, and the reason for rejection.*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

All valid change requests and the change request log will be posted on ~~the provider~~Qwest's web site.

~~Customer~~CLECs may submit a formal request to ~~the provider~~Qwest to re-rate a change request no later than fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the next prioritization review. The request must include a reason for requesting the re-rate. This will normally be done via e-mail to ~~the provider~~Qwest with a copy to all Change Management team members.

~~Customer~~CLEC initiated requests are Type 5, except when the proposed change has an impact on a regulatory mandate, e.g. metrics. Change requests that have impact on regulatory mandates are Type 2.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

~~II.~~VII. *Provider Originated Requests*

Provider initiated requests are Type 4, except when the proposed change has an impact on a regulatory mandate, e.g. metrics. Change requests that have impact on regulatory mandates are Type 2.

Type 4 requests will be made available to ~~customer~~CLECs at least fourteen (14) calendar days prior to a scheduled prioritization review. The Type 4 change requests, except those that are related to new products or services, are prioritized by ~~customer~~CLECs with Type 5 change requests (see Prioritization section).

If ~~the provider~~Qwest announces a new interface before applicable guidelines are finalized at the appropriate industry forums, ~~the provider~~Qwest will review the final guidelines when they are issued. The review will determine any alterations that may be necessary for compliance with the finalized requirements and will work the changes within the guidelines of the CMP. ~~The provider~~Qwest will review its system requirements and provide known exceptions to industry guidelines.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

INTRODUCTION OF A NEW INTERFACE

The process for introducing a new interface will be part of the CMP.

I. *Release Planning*

At least nine (9) months in advance of the target implementation date, ~~the provider~~Qwest will share the new interface plans via web site posting and ~~customer~~CLEC notification.

~~The provider~~Qwest will share preliminary plans for the new interface, including:

- *Proposed functionality of the interface*
- *Proposed detailed implementation time line (e.g., milestone dates, ~~customer~~CLEC/provider comment/response turnaround dates)*
- *Provider constraints*
- *Exceptions to industry guidelines/standards, etc.*
- *Proposed ~~customer~~CLEC/provider meeting plans (The first scheduled meeting should be held no sooner than fourteen (14) calendar days following publication of the ~~customer~~CLEC notification.)*
- *Requirements*
- *Design & Development*
- *Connectivity and Firewall Rules*
- *Test Planning*
- *Implementation*
- *Change Control*

II. *~~Customer~~CLEC Responses/Comments*

Upon review of the preliminary plans for the interface if the ~~customer~~CLEC wishes to provide feedback the ~~customer~~CLEC must send a written response to ~~the provider~~Qwest. These responses must be provided no later than seven (7) calendar days prior to the first scheduled meeting. The ~~customer~~CLEC's response will specify the ~~customer~~CLEC's questions, issues and any alternative recommendations.
~~Customer~~CLECs may provide feedback to ~~the provider~~Qwest during ~~customer~~CLEC/provider meetings. Additional ~~customer~~CLEC feedback may be

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

provided in accordance with the dates outlined in the detailed implementation time line.

III. *Provider Responses/Comments*

~~The provider~~Qwest will maintain both a proprietary and non-proprietary issue log containing ~~customer~~CLEC comments and ~~the provider~~Qwest responses. This non-proprietary issue log will be posted to ~~the provider~~Qwest's web site upon receipt of ~~customer~~CLEC feedback. ~~The provider~~Qwest will respond to the ~~customer~~CLEC feedback in accordance with the dates outlined in the detailed implementation time line. ~~The provider~~Qwest will also communicate its base line interface development plans via web site posting and ~~customer~~CLEC notification in accordance with the dates outlined in the detailed implementation time line.

IV. *Final Release Announcement*

~~The provider~~Qwest will provide a Final Release Announcement to the ~~customer~~CLECs via web site posting and a carrier notification.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

CHANGE TO EXISTING INTERFACES

~~I.Interface~~ Pre-order, Order application-to-application Change Process
(Action item#)

As part of its rolling twelve (12) month development view, ~~providers~~Qwest will prepare a preliminary package of the required changes and will share these plans at scheduled change management meetings. ~~Providers~~Qwest should make available two (2) versions of an interface between the sunrise and sunset dates.

Unless mandated, ~~the provider~~Qwest will implement no more than four (4) releases requiring coding changes to the ~~customer~~CLEC interfaces within a calendar year. These changes should occur no less than three (3) months apart.

~~II.~~V. *Versioning of Type 1 Changes*

For Type 1 changes, the version number will not be incremented and will not cause the oldest dot version of the current version to be retired as a result of the implemented fix.

~~III.~~VI. *Versioning of Type 2 Changes*

For Type 2 changes that must occur between regularly scheduled releases, ~~the provider~~Qwest will not retire the oldest version in order to implement the Type 2 change. The Type 2 change will be implemented as either a dot release or a sub-dot release of all versions (except a retired version), unless the structure of the old version could not accommodate the Type 2 change or the old version is scheduled to be retired within the next six months.

If the Type 2 change results in an interface implementation, before applicable industry guidelines are finalized at the appropriate industry forums, dot release versioning is issued. An example of dot versioning of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation is V5.1.

If the Type 2 change results in an interface implementation that is in line with industry guidelines, sub-dot release versioning is issued. An example of sub-dot release of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation is V5.0.1.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Type 2 changes that occur at the time of a regularly scheduled release will be made in all versions (except a retired version). If the structure or intent of the old version cannot accommodate the change then, via the Prioritization process a joint provider/~~customer~~CLEC decision is made that the mandate should not be implemented in an old version.

~~IV.~~VII. *Versioning of Type 3 Changes*

For Type 3 changes, the base version identity should follow the LSOG issue identity. For example, the first release of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation should be V5.0.

~~V.~~VIII. *Versioning of Type 4 and Type 5 Changes*

Type 4 and Type 5 changes will be implemented as a sub-dot release of all versions, unless the structure of the old version could not accommodate the Type 4 or Type 5 change.

If the Type 4 or Type 5 change results in an interface implementation, before applicable industry guidelines are finalized at the appropriate industry forums, dot release versioning is issued. An example of dot versioning of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation is V5.1.

If the Type 4 or Type 5 change results in an interface implementation that is in line with industry guidelines, sub-dot release versioning is issued. An example of sub-dot release of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation is V5.0.1.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

RETIREMENT OF EXISTING INTERFACES

The retirement of an interface is ~~the provider~~Qwest's elimination of an existing interface (i.e., paper, GUI, Gateway).

I. *Initial Retirement Plans*

At least nine (9) months in advance of the target retirement date, ~~the provider~~Qwest will share the retirement plans via web site posting and ~~customer~~CLEC notification. If the functionality exists through another interface, ~~the provider~~Qwest will announce the retirement nine (9) months prior to the actual retirement. If the equivalent functionality does not exist through an existing interface but will reside in a scheduled new interface, ~~the provider~~Qwest will announce the retirement at the same time as the new interface. The scheduled new interface is to be in a ~~customer~~CLEC certified production release prior to the retirement of the older interface.

The ~~customer~~CLEC notification will contain:

- *The rationale for retiring the interface*
- *The proposed detailed retirement time line (e.g., milestone dates, ~~customer~~CLEC/provider comment/response turnaround dates)*

II. *Final Retirement Notice*

The Final Retirement Notice will be provided to ~~customer~~CLECs and contain:

- *Where the replacement functionality will reside in a new interface and when the new interface has been certified by a ~~customer~~CLEC*
- *Provider's responses to the ~~customer~~CLECs' comments*
- *Actual retirement date*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

ADMINISTRATION
MANAGING THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS
FROM AUGUST 8, 2001 REDLINED FRAMEWORK

I. Change Management POC

~~The provider~~ Qwest and each ~~customer~~CLEC will designate primary and secondary change management POC(s) who will serve as the official designees for matters regarding this CMP. The primary POC is the official voting member, and a secondary (alternate) POC can vote in the absence of the primary POC for each CLEC..

~~II.Purpose of Change Management POC~~

~~The change management POC will serve as the official designee for all matters regarding change management, including:~~

- ~~Submission of change request forms~~
- ~~Notification of critical matters, such as Type 1 errors~~

~~The customers~~CLECs and Qwest will exchange POC information including items such as: ~~must provide the following information to the provider's change management POC:~~

- Name
- Title
- Company
- Telephone number
- E-mail address
- Fax number
- Cell phone/Pager number

~~III.~~Change Management POC List ~~Creation~~
II.

~~The provider will create a distribution list and publish this list.~~ Primary and secondary CLEC POCs should be included in the Qwest maintained distribution list. ~~At least a primary customer POC and secondary customer~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

~~POC should be included in the distribution list~~. It is the CLECs responsibility to notify Qwest of any POC changes. ~~It is the provider's responsibility to maintain and update the information on the list with the assistance of the customer. This list will be used to update customers on change management issues.~~ The list will be made available to all participating CLECs with the permission of the POCs.

~~IV.~~III. ~~Formal~~ Preferred Method of Communication

~~The standard methods of communication are mail, e-mail, web site, telephone, and fax. Critical matters will be communicated using the distribution list.~~ The preferred method of communication is e-mail with supporting information posted to the web site

~~V.~~IV. *Governing Body*

The change management organizational structure must support the CMP. Each position within the organization has defined roles and responsibilities as outlined below.

CMP Team: Representatives are from the ~~customer~~CLECs (or their authorized agents) and ~~the provider~~Qwest. This team meets monthly to review, prioritize, and make recommendations for change management requests. The change management requests are used as input to internal change management processes.

CMP Steering Committee: The CMP Steering Committee consists of representatives from the ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest who will be responsible for managing compliance to the CMP document. The responsibilities of the CMP Steering Committee are:

- *On-going commitment*
- *Participation in change management meetings/conference calls*
- *Reviewing changes/suggestions to the CMP document for submittal to OBF*
- *Process improvements*
- *Managing meeting schedule/logistics*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

A standing agenda item at the regular change management meetings will provide an opportunity for ~~the provider~~Qwest and ~~customer~~CLECs to assess the effectiveness of the CMP. Both the ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest will use this opportunity to provide feedback of instances of non-compliance and commit to taking appropriate action(s).

Provider POC: ~~The provider~~Qwest POC is responsible for managing the CMP. ~~The provider~~Qwest POC will be responsible for maintaining the integrity of the change requests, preparing for and facilitating review meetings, presenting change requests to ~~the provider~~Qwest's internal CMP, and ensuring that all notifications are communicated to the appropriate parties.

~~Customer~~CLEC POC: The ~~customer~~CLEC POC will serve as the official designee for all matters regarding CMP, including:

- *Submission of ~~customer~~CLEC change request forms*
- *Notification of critical matters, such as Type 1 errors*

Release Management Team: A team of ~~customer~~CLEC and provider representatives who manage the implementation of scheduled releases.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

MEETINGS

~~Change Management meetings will be conducted monthly.~~
FROM AUGUST 8, 2001 REDLINED FRAMEWORK

Change Management meetings will be conducted on a regularly scheduled basis, at least on a monthly basis. Meeting participants can choose to attend meetings in person or participate by conference call.

Meetings are held to review, prioritize, manage the implementation of process and system changes and address change management requests. Qwest will review the status of all applicable change requests. The meeting may also include discussions of Qwest's development view.

CLEC's request for additional agenda items and associated materials should be submitted to Qwest at least five (5) business days by noon (MST) in advance of the meeting. Qwest is responsible for distributing the agenda and associated meeting materials at least three (3) business days by noon (MST) in advance of the meeting. Qwest will be responsible for preparing, maintaining, and distributing meeting minutes . Attendees with any walk-on items should bring materials of the walk-on items to the meeting.

All attendees, whether in person or by phone, must identify themselves and the company they represent.

Additional meetings may be held at the request of Qwest or any qualified CLEC (as defined in this document). Meeting notification must contain an agenda plus any supporting meeting materials. These meetings should be announced at least five (5) business days prior to their occurrence. Exceptions may be made for emergency situations.

~~The provider is responsible for notifying customers and distributing agendas and other meeting materials to include, but not limited to, actual change requests received from the customers and documentation of industry~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (*including* application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

~~guidelines and regulatory changes at least seven (7)calendar days in advance of the meeting.~~
~~Customers can choose to attend meetings in person or participate by conference call. The provider must make a conference bridge available for meetings. The agenda will include the dial-in number and the access information.~~

~~The provider will be responsible for preparing, maintaining, and distributing minutes following the meeting. The draft version of the minutes must be distributed no later than seven (7) calendar days after the meeting and must contain the name of each attendee and the company they represent. All attendees, whether in person or by phone, must identify themselves and the company they represent. The provider will also update the status of change requests after the meeting and distribute it following the meeting as part of the meeting minutes.~~

~~Emergency or special meetings may be held at the request of the provider or any qualified customer (as defined in this document). Emergency meeting notification must contain an agenda plus any supporting meeting materials. These meetings should be announced at least two (2) business days prior to their occurrence.~~

Meeting Materials [Distribution Package] for Change Management Meeting
FROM AUGUST 8, 2001 REDLINED FRAMEWORK

Meeting materials should include the following information:

- Meeting Logistics
- Minutes from previous meeting
- Agenda
- Change Requests and responses
  - New/Active
  - Updated
  - Log
- Issues, Action Items Log and associated statuses
- Release Summary[1]2 Month Development View
- Monthly System Outage Report
- Any other material to be discussed

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Qwest will provide Meeting Materials (Distribution Package) electronically by noon 3 business days prior to the Monthly CMP Meeting. In addition, Qwest will provide hard copies of the Distribution Package at the Monthly CMP Meeting.

~~Agenda Items for Change Management Meeting~~

~~Agenda items should include but are not limited to, the following:~~

- ~~Change Request discussions~~
- ~~Issues/Actions~~
- ~~Release Notice/ 12 Month Development View~~
- ~~Effectiveness of change management Process~~
- ~~Specifications for regulatory or industry originated change requests~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

~~II.Change Management Meeting Action Log and Change Request Status~~

~~The provider will maintain and distribute at the change management meeting an Action Item Log containing action items from previous meetings and status. Additionally, during the change management meetings, the provider will review status of the customer change requests. The meeting will include discussions of the provider's development view, as well as any customer's suggested development to the provider Operations Support Systems (OSSs).~~

~~III.~~Meeting Minutes for Change Management Meeting
FROM AUGUST 8, 2001 REDLINED FRAMEWORK

- Qwest will take minutes.

Qwest will summarize discussions in meeting minutes and include any revised documents such as Issues, Action items and statuses.

Minutes should be distributed to meeting participants for comments or revisions no later than five (5) business days by noon (MST)after the meeting. CLEC comments should be provided within two (2) business days by noon (MST). Revised minutes, if CLEC comments are received , should be distributed within nine (9) business days by noon (MST) after the meeting.

~~The provider will take minutes during the meeting. Meeting minutes should include, but are not limited to, the following:~~

~~Current status of change requests and Release Notices~~
~~Issues/Action items and status~~
~~Attendees/Company~~

~~A draft version of the minutes should be distributed to meeting participants for comments or revisions no later than seven (7) calendar days after the meeting. Customers need to respond to the provider with any modifications to the draft version within two (2) business days. Revisions and comments will be incorporated into the final minutes. The final minutes will be distributed within eleven (11) calendar days after the meeting.~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

~~IV.~~V. ~~Provider~~Qwest ~~Change Management Process~~ Wholesale CMP Web Site[Need to re-visit – ACTION ITEM #17G]

FROM AUGUST 8, 2001 REDLINED FRAMEWORK

To facilitate access to CMP documentation, ~~the provider~~Qwest will maintain CMP information on its web site. The web site should be easy to use and updated in a timely manner. The Web site should be a well organized central repository for CLEC notifications and CMP documentation. Active documentation including meeting materials (Distribution Package), should be maintained on the website. Change Requests and release notifications should be identified in accordance with the agreed upon naming convention, to facilitate ease of identification. [action item #] Qwest will maintain closed and old versions of documents on the web site's Archive page for 18 months before storing off line. Information that has been removed from the web site can be obtained by contacting the appropriate Qwest CMP Manager. ~~-~~At a minimum, the CMP web site will ~~contain~~ include:

- Current version of ~~the provider~~Qwest CMP document describing CMP's purpose and scope of setting forth the CMP objectives, procedures, and timelines, including release life cycles.
- Calendar of release dates
- OSS hours of availability
- Links to related web sites, such as IMA EDI, IMA GUI, CEMR, and Notices
- Current CMP escalation process
- CMP prioritization process description and guidelines
- Change Request form and instructions to complete form
- Submitted and open Change Requests and the status of each
- Responses to Change Requests and written responses to CLEC inquiries
- Meeting (formal and informal) information for CMP monthly meetings and interim meetings or conference calls, including descriptions of meetings and participants, agendas, sign-up forms, and schedules
- ~~Joint Release Test Plan Template~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

- A log of ~~customer~~ CLEC and ~~provider~~ Qwest change requests and associated statuses
- ~~Issue/Action items and statuses~~Meeting materials(distribution package)
- Meeting minutes
- Release announcements and other CLEC notifications and associated requirements
- Directory to CLEC notifications for the month
- Business rules, SATE test case scenarios technical specifications, and user guides will be provided via links on the CMP web site. ~~based on the LSOG and provider's specific requirements~~
- Contact information for the CMP POC list, including CLEC, Qwest and other participants (with participant consent to publish contact information on web page).

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

I. *Draft Interface Release Requirements*

Prior to implementing a new interface or a change to an existing interface, ~~the provider~~Qwest will notify ~~customer~~CLECs of the draft release requirements.

Notification and confirmation time lines for Type 1 are determined on an individual case basis based on the severity of the problem.

Notifications for Type 2 changes are based on applicable law and / or regulatory rules.

Type 3 time lines are based on ~~customer~~CLEC / provider agreement in conjunction with the rollout of national guidelines, (See Issue 1714: New Issue Life Cycle Process) subject to any overriding regulatory obligations.

Generally, a Type 4 and Type 5 change notification will occur at least 73 calendar days prior to implementing the change. Draft business rules / technical specifications will be produced and distributed to ~~customer~~CLECs 66 calendar days prior to implementation. ~~Customer~~CLECs have fifteen (15) calendar days from the initial publication of draft documentation to provide comments / questions on the documentation. Change confirmation will occur 45 calendar days prior to implementation through publication of final business rules / technical specifications.

For Type 4 or Type 5 change requests more or less notification may be provided based on severity and the impact of the change. For example, ~~the provider~~Qwest can implement the change in less than 45 calendar days.

Documentation of new or revised error messages associated with Type 4 or Type 5 change requests will be provided no later than 30 calendar days prior to implementation date.

II. *Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements*

The Notification letter will contain:

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

- *Written summary of change(s)*
- *Target time frame for implementation*
- *Any cross-reference to updated documentation such as the Users Guide. This type of documentation should also include a summary of changes made to the document*

III. *Walk Through of Draft Interface Release Requirements*

If requested by one or more ~~customer~~CLECs within fourteen (14) calendar days of receiving the initial Release Requirements, ~~the provider~~Qwest will sponsor a walk through with the appropriate internal subject matter experts. ~~The provider~~Qwest will hold this walk through no later than thirty (30) calendar days prior to the scheduled implementation.

IV. *~~Customer~~CLEC's Comments on Draft Interface Release Requirements*

If the ~~customer~~CLEC identifies issues or requires clarification, the ~~customer~~CLEC must send a written response to ~~the provider~~Qwest and the ~~customer~~CLEC's Account Manager. ~~The provider~~Qwest must receive the ~~customer~~CLEC's response seven (7) calendar days prior to the date of the Initial Release Requirements. The response will specify the ~~customer~~CLEC's questions, issues and any other alternative recommendations for implementation.

V. *Provider Response to Comments*

~~The provider~~Qwest will review and respond with written answers to all ~~customer~~CLEC issues, comments/concerns within seven (7) calendar days. The answers will be shared with all ~~customer~~CLECs, unless the question (s) are marked proprietary. Any changes that may occur as a result of the responses will be distributed to all ~~customer~~CLECs in the same notification letter.

VI. *Final Interface Release Requirements*

The notification letter resulting from the ~~customer~~CLEC's response from the Initial Release Notification will constitute the Final Release Requirements.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

VII. *Content of Final Interface Release Requirements*

In addition to the content of Interface Initial Release Requirements, the Final Release will include the following:

- *Summary of changes from ~~the provider~~Qwest response to comments*
- *Indication of type of change (e.g., documentation change, business rule change, clarification change)*
- *Changed requirements pages*
- *Release date*
- *Interval before implementation of release*

~~The provider~~Qwest's planned implementation date will not be sooner than forty-five (45) calendar days from the date of the final release requirements. ~~The provider~~Qwest will post notification to provider's web site to inform the ~~customer~~CLECs of possible impact to ~~customer~~CLEC ordering ability. ~~The provider~~Qwest will post this information forty-five (45) calendar days prior to the scheduled implementation of such changes, if possible, but not less than thirty (30) calendar days prior to implementation. Emergency changes that occur without advance notification will be posted within 24 hours of the change. The implementation time line for the release will not begin until all related documentation is provided.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

PRIORITIZATION

I. *Prioritization Review*

The prioritization review provides the forum for reviewing and prioritizing Type 4 and Type 5 change requests. ~~The provider~~Qwest will facilitate the meeting. Both ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~providers~~Qwest should have appropriate subject matter experts in attendance. Meetings will be held monthly, or more frequently if needed, and are open to all ~~customer~~CLECs. The prioritization review objectives are to:

- *Introduce newly initiated ~~customer~~CLEC and provider change requests.*
- *Allow ~~customer~~CLECs to prioritize new change requests and re-rate existing change requests by providing specific input as to the relative importance that ~~customer~~CLECs, as a group, assign to each such change request.*
- *Provide status on outstanding ~~customer~~CLEC and provider change requests.*
- *~~The provider~~Qwest will distribute all materials fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the prioritization review. The materials will include:*
  - *Agenda*
  - *Prioritized spreadsheet of Type 4 and Type 5 change requests*
  - *Spreadsheet of change requests pending initial rating and re-rating (see Appendix B)*
  - *New change requests as submitted by initiating ~~customer~~CLEC or provider*

II. *Prioritization Process*

During the review, the initiators will present their new change requests and any requests for re-rate. This will be followed by a question and answer session. After all presentations are complete, the voting of change requests will begin.

Re-rate requests will only be accepted from ~~customer~~CLECs who participated in the initial voting. Once a re-rate is requested, all ~~customer~~CLECs participating at the subsequent meeting can submit a rating.

~~Customer~~CLECs may request and rate a modification to a new change request at the prioritization review, if agreed to by the originating ~~customer~~CLEC(s). The

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

originating ~~customer~~CLEC must update the change request with the agreed upon modification.

III. *Voting*

Voting should be conducted according to the following guidelines:

- *A ~~customer~~CLEC must either be using the interface impacted by the change request or have a Letter of Intent to use the interface on file with ~~the provider~~Qwest to participate in the vote.*
- *Each ~~customer~~CLEC is allowed one vote per change request and should have one representative responsible to provide a rating. Each ~~customer~~CLEC can only assign a rating to a change request at the prioritization review. A rating will not be accepted outside of the prioritization review.*
- *~~Customer~~CLECs may only provide a rating at the meeting where the new change request is introduced. ~~Customer~~CLECs that were not present at that meeting may not submit ratings at subsequent meetings, unless there is a request to re-rate.*
- *A ~~customer~~CLEC may delegate its vote to an authorized agent acting on its behalf by providing a Letter of Authority.*
- *Each participating ~~customer~~CLEC ranks each change request by providing a rank from 1 (low) to 5 (high). Votes will be averaged to determine order of ranking and results (see Appendix C) will be provided prior to the close of the prioritization review.*
- *~~Customer~~CLECs can defer/pass on voting. A rating of defer or pass will not be averaged in the overall rating.*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

ESCALATION PROCESS
FROM SEPTEMBER 20, 2001 REDESIGN SESSION

I. Guidelines

- The escalation process will include items that are defined as within the CMP scope.
- The decision to escalate is left to the discretion of the ~~customer~~CLEC, based on the severity of the missed or unaccepted response/resolution
- Escalations may also involve issues related to CMP itself, including the administration of the CMP ~~can involve issues related to the CMP, itself~~
- ~~Escalations involving change requests,~~ the expectation is that escalation should occur only after ~~normal~~ change management procedures have occurred per the CMP

~~Three (3) levels of escalation shall be available. They are:~~

~~1.The customer's change management director (or designated agent) to provider's change management director~~

~~2.The customer's change management director to provider's account director~~

~~3.The customer's vice-president to provider's vice-president~~

~~Each level of escalation will go through the same cycle, as follows:~~

II. Cycle

Item must be formally escalated as an e-mail sent to the Qwest CMP escalation e-mail address [URL to be established] ~~the appropriate provider escalation level.~~

- Subject line of the escalation e-mail must include:
  - CLEC Company name
  - "ESCALATION"
  - Change Request (CR) number and status, if applicable
- Content of e-mail must enclose appropriate supporting documentation, if applicable, and to the extent that the supporting documentation does not include the following information, the following must be provided.:
  - Description of item being escalated
  - History of item

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

  - Reason for Escalation
  - Business need and impact
  - Desired CLEC resolution
  - CLEC contact information including Name, Title, Phone Number, and e-mail address
  - CLEC may request that impacted activities be stopped, continued or an interim solution be established.
- Qwest will acknowledge receipt of the complete escalation e-mail with an acknowledgement of the e-mail no later than the close of business of the following business day. If the escalation email does not contain the following specified information Qwest will notify the CLEC by the close of business on the following business day, identifying and requesting information that was not originally included. When the escalation email is complete, the acknowledgement email will include:
  - Date and time of escalation receipt
  - Date and time of acknowledgement email
  - Name, phone number and email address of the Qwest Director, or above, assigned to the escalation.
-

~~Subject of e-mail must be customer (Customer Name) ESCALATION (CR# if applicable) Level of Escalation~~

~~Content of e-mail must include~~

~~Definition and escalation of item~~

~~History of item~~

~~Reason for escalation~~

~~Desired outcome of customer~~

- Qwest will post escalated issue and any associated responses on the CMP web site within 1 business day of receipt of the complete escalation or response. [see action item]
- Qwest will give notification that an escalation has been requested via the Industry Mail Out process [in a time frame to be determined – Jarby]
- Any other CLEC wishing to participate in the escalation must submit an e-mail notification to the escalation URL within one (1) business day of the mail out. The subject line of the e-mail must include the title of the escalated issue followed by "ESCALATION PARTICIPATION"

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

- ~~Impact to customer of not meeting the desired outcome or item remaining on current course of action as previously discussed at the prioritization review (if escalation is associated with a change request)~~
- ~~Impact to customer of a rejected change request~~
- ~~Contact information for appropriate level including Name, Title, Phone Number, and e-mail ID~~
- ~~It is not necessary to repeat information for level 2 and 3 escalations. However, the e-mail submission should include any additional information since the last distribution, including the reason that the matter could not be resolved at previous level~~
- ~~The provider will reply to the escalation request with an acknowledgment of receipt within 1 business day~~
- ~~Within seven (7) calendar days of receipt, the appropriate provider change management executive (Level 1-2: Director or Level 3: Vice President) will reply through provider change management with provider position and explanation for that position~~
- Qwest will respond with a binding position e-mail including supporting rationale a~~A~~s soon as practicable, but no later than:
  - For escalated CRs, seven (7) ~~fourteen (14)~~ calendar days of sending the acknowledgement e-mail, ~~Qwest will respond with a binding position e-mail including supporting rationale~~.
  - For all other escalations, fourteen (14) calendar days of sending the acknowledgment e-mail.
- The escalating ~~customer should~~ CLEC will respond to ~~the provider~~Qwest within seven (7) calendar days with a binding position e-mail. ~~as to whether escalation will continue or the provider response has been accepted as closure to the item~~
- ~~If the provider's position suggests a change in the current disposition of the item, a conference call will be held within 1 business day of the provider's decision in order to arrive at consensus with the appropriate executives~~
- ~~The provider will publish the outcome of the conference call via e-mail~~
- ~~For escalations associated with Type 1 changes, the provider has a one day turnaround rather than 5 for each cycle of escalation~~
- When the escalation is closed, the resolution will be subject to the CMP.

~~3.4.2.1 Flow of Escalation Table~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

INTERFACE TESTING

~~The provider~~ Qwest will provide a separate Customer Test Environment (CTE) for the testing of application-to-application interfaces for pre-order and order. There are two types of testing: new release testing and production support. New release testing provides the opportunity to test the code associated with releases for Types 2 through 5 change requests. Production support testing allows ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~providers~~ Qwest to test changes made as a result of Type 1 change request implementation.

I. *New Release & Production Support Testing in the ~~Customer~~CLEC Test Environment (CTE)*

This section provides information regarding the CTE and the procedures for new release and Production Support testing.

The CTE is a separate environment that contains the application-to-application interface and gateway applications for preordering and ordering. This environment is used for ~~customer~~CLEC testing – both new release testing and new entrant testing. ~~Customer~~CLECs are responsible for establishing and maintaining connectivity into the CTE. Provided a ~~customer~~CLEC uses the same connectivity option as it uses in production, the ~~customer~~CLEC should, in general, experience response times similar to production. However, this environment is not intended for volume testing. The CTE contains the appropriate applications for pre-ordering and Local Service Request (LSR) ordering up to and including the service order processor.

Any special procedures required due to geographical or system differences will be reviewed with the participating ~~customer~~CLEC prior to the implementation of their testing phase.

II. *New Release Testing*

New release testing is the process ~~customer~~CLECs use to test an upcoming ~~provider~~Qwest systems release that impacts the interface and business rules between ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

III. *Getting Ready for the New Release Testing*

~~Customer~~CLECs should be notified of the content of the release through the change management process. ~~Customer~~CLECs should review the content of the release and determine if they want to participate in the test and what transactions they would like to submit as part of the test.

~~The provider~~Qwest will send an industry notification, including testing schedules, to ~~customer~~CLECs so they may determine their intent to participate in the test. ~~Customer~~CLECs wishing to participate in the test should make arrangements with ~~the provider~~Qwest testing coordinator. ~~The provider~~Qwest will publish any changes to the schedule.

IV. *Production Support Testing*

Production Support testing occurs in a production like environment used in support of new entrant testing. New entrant testing is intended for those ~~customer~~CLECs that are not currently in production or that want to test new ordering or pre-ordering transactions for which they have not been through testing.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

TRAINING

All changes to existing interfaces, as well as the introduction of new interfaces, will be incorporated into ~~customer~~CLEC training.

~~Providers~~Qwest—may conduct ~~customer~~CLEC workshops. ~~Customer~~CLEC workshops are organized and facilitated by ~~the provider~~Qwest and can serve any one of the following purposes:

- *Educate ~~customer~~CLECs on a particular process or business function*
- *Collect feedback from ~~customer~~CLECs on a particular process or business function*
- *Provide a forum for ~~providers~~Qwest or ~~customer~~CLECs to lobby for the implementation of a particular process or business function*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Dispute Resolution Process
FROM SEPTEMBER 20, 2001 REDESIGN SESSION

- CLECs and Qwest will work together in good faith to resolve any issue brought before the CMP [define Good Faith]. In the event that an impasse issue develops, ~~is not resolved through the Escalation Process described in Section xx has been followed without resulting in a resolution~~, a party may pursue the dispute resolution processes set forth below:~~the dispute shall be resolved by either method set forth below.~~ Item must be formally noticed as an e-mail sent to the Qwest CMP Dispute Resolution e-mail address [URL to be established] Subject line of the e-mail must include:
    - CLEC Company name
    - "Dispute Resolution"
    - Change Request (CR) number and status, if applicable
- Content of e-mail must enclose appropriate supporting documentation, if applicable, and to the extent that the supporting documentation does not include the following information, the following must be provided:
    - Description of item
    - History of item
    - Reason for Escalation
    - Business need and impact
    - Desired CLEC resolution
    - CLEC contact information including Name, Title, Phone Number, and e-mail address
    - Qwest will acknowledge receipt of the complete Dispute Resolution e-mail within one (1) business day

- Qwest or any CLEC may suggest that the issue be resolved through an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process, such as arbitration or mediation using the American Arbitration Association (AAA) or other rules. If the parties agree to use an ADR process and agree upon the process and rules to be used, including whether the results of the ADR process are binding, the dispute will be resolved through the agreed-upon ADR process.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the *CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.*

~~Qwest or any CLEC affected by the dispute, may request mediation by a third party. If mediation is requested, parties shall participate in good faith. Qwest and the CLECs affected by the dispute must agree to the terms of the mediation, including the payment of costs and fees. If the mediation results in the resolution of the dispute, that resolution shall apply to all CLECs affected by the dispute. If mediation is not successful in resolving the issue, Qwest or any CLEC may use the process set forth below.[action item for proposed language]~~

- Without the necessity for a prior ADR Process[~~contingent on first bullet~~], Qwest or any CLEC may submit the issue, following the commission's established procedures, with the appropriate regulatory agency requesting resolution of the dispute. This provision is not intended to change the scope of any regulatory agency's authority with regard to Qwest or the CLECs.

~~However, T~~this process does not limit any party's right to seek remedies in a regulatory or legal arena at any time.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Term	*Definition*
~~CUSTOMER~~ CLEC	*Party originating a request (LSR)*

INTERFACE	*A mechanism to communicate between ~~customer~~CLEC/provider or trading partners (e.g., paper, GUI, gateway)*
	• *A new interface is ~~the provider~~Qwest's introduction of paper, GUI, gateway, etc., to all ~~customer~~CLECs for the first time.*
	• *A change to an interface may include:*
	  • *Paper to GUI*
	  • *Changes of EDI to CORBA*

ISSUE	*The specific OBF LSOG Issue (e.g., Local Services Ordering Guidelines (LSOG) document, Issue 5, August 2000)*
PROVIDER	*Party receiving request (LSR)*
RELEASE	*Implementation of version (Type 3 change) using a particular interface. A release may include enhancements or customization (Type 1,2,4 or 5 change) to an LSOG version by a provider as well as ~~customer~~CLEC/provider business requirements.*
VERSION	*The supported OBF LSOG Issue (e.g., Local Services Ordering Guidelines (LSOG) document, Issue 5, August 2000)* *(Type 3 change)*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

ANSI	*American National Standards Institute*
ATIS	*Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions*
CMP	*Change Management Process*
ECIC	*Electronic Communications Implementation Committee*
EDI	*Electronic Data Interchange*
FCC	*Federal Communications Commission*
GUI	*Graphical User Interface*
ITU	*International Telecommunications Union*
LOI	*Letter of Intent*
LSR	*Local Service Request*
NRIC	*Network Reliability and Interoperability Council*
OBF	*Ordering and Billing Forum*
OIS	*Outstanding Issue Solution*
OSS	*Operational Support Systems*
POC	*Point Of Contact*
RN	*Release Notification*
TCIF	*Telecommunications Industry Forum*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

APPENDIX A: CHANGE REQUEST FORM AND CHECKLIST

I. *Appendix A-1: Change Request Form*

---

(1) Internal Reference # _____ *(2) Date Change Request Submitted* ___/___/___

(3) ☐ ***TYPE 1 (EMERGENCY)*** *(4)* ☐ ***TYPE 2 (REGULATORY)*** *(5)* ☐ ***TYPE 3 (INDUSTRY)***
- ☐ *Severity 1 (stops production)*
- ☐ *Severity 2 (impacts production)*
- ☐ *Severity 3 (major w/work around)*

(6) ☐ ***TYPE 4 (PROVIDER)*** *(7)* ☐ ***TYPE 5 (~~CUSTOMER~~CLEC)***

(4) ~~Customer~~CLEC _____

(5) Originator _____ *(6) Phone* _____

(7) Originator's Email Address _____ *(8) Fax* _____

(9) Alternate Contact _____ *(10) Alt Phone #* _____

(11) Title of Change _____

(12) ***Category*** ☐ *Add New Functionality* ☐ *Change Existing*

(13) ***Interfaces Impacted***
- ☐ *Pre-Ordering*
- ☐ *Ordering*
- ☐ *Maintenance*
- ☐ *Manual*
- ☐ *Billing*
- ☐ *Business Rules*
- ☐ *Other*

(14) Description of requested change including purpose and benefit received from this change. (Use additional sheets, if necessary.)

_____
_____
_____
_____

(15) Known dependencies

_____
_____
_____
_____

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

(16) List all business specifications and/or requirements documents included (or Internet / Standards location, if applicable)

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

This Section to be completed by Provider ONLY.

*(17) Change Request Log #*_____ *(18) Clarification* ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*

(19) Clarification Request Sent ___/___/___ *(20) Clarification Response Due* ___/___/___

(21) Status _____

(22) Change Request Review Date __/__/__ *(23) Target Implementation Date* ___/___/__

(24) Last Modified By _____ *(25) Date Modified* ___/___/___

(26) ***Change Request Activity***

_____
_____
_____
_____

(27) ***Rejected Change Request***

- ☐ *Cost/benefits*
- ☐ *Resource commitments*
- ☐ *Industry or regulatory direction*
- ☐ *Provider direction*
- ☐ *Other*

_____
_____

(28) Cancellation Acknowledgment ~~*Customer*~~*CLEC* _____ *Provider*_____ *Date* ___/___/___

(29) ***Request Escalation*** ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*

(30) ***Escalation Considerations***

_____
_____
_____
_____

(31) ***Agreed Release Date*** ___/___/___

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

This section to be completed by Provider – Internal Validation of Defect Change Request.
(32) ***Defect Validation Results:***

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

II. *Appendix A-2: Change Request Form Checklist*

All fields will be validated before Change Request is returned for clarification.

Field	Checklist	Description	Instructions	Action Required
1	Optional	Optional field for the initiator to use for internal tracking. The request may be generated prior to submission into ~~the Provider~~Qwest's change control process.	No action	
2	Mandatory	Date Change Request sent to Provider.	Return to Sender	Date entry required
3	Mandatory	Indicate type of Change Request: ~~Customer~~CLEC or Provider initiated Industry Standard or Regulatory.	Return to Sender	Company designation required
4	Mandatory	Enter company name for the Change Request.	Return to Sender	Company name required
5	Mandatory	Enter originating company's Change Control Initiator's name.	Return to Sender	Initiator's name required
6	Mandatory	Enter originating company's Change Control Initiator's phone number.	Return to Sender	Initiator's phone number required
7	Mandatory	Enter originating company's Change Control Initiator's Email address.	Return to Sender	Initiator's Email address required
8	Mandatory	Enter originating company's Change Control Initiator's fax number.	Return to Sender	Initiator's fax number required
9	Mandatory	Enter originating company's alternate contact name.	Return to Sender	Alternate contact name required
10	Mandatory	Enter originating company's alternate contact phone number.	Return to Sender	Alternate contact number required
11	Mandatory	For the purpose of referencing the Change Request, assign a short, but descriptive name.	Return to Sender	Title required – maximum length 40 characters.
12	Mandatory	Identify request category for the Change Request.	Return to Sender	Category required
13	Mandatory	Identify originating company assessment of impact	Return to Sender	Entry required
14	Mandatory	Describe the proposed Change Request, indicating the purpose and benefit of request. If additional space is needed, use additional sheet.	Return to Sender	Description of Change Request required
15	Mandatory	Indicate any known dependencies relative to the Change Request. If none are known, enter "None known".	Return to Sender	Entry required

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Field	Checklist	Description	Instructions	Action Required
16	*Mandatory*	*Indicate whether additional information accompanies/supports the proposed Change Request If yes, list all documents attached or reference where they can be found, including internet address and standards reference, if applicable.*	*Return to Sender*	*Supporting documentation must accompany request*
17	*Mandatory Provider*	*A Change Request Log Number generated by the "Change Request Logging system" upon receipt of the Change Request. The number should be sent back to the initiator on the acknowledgment receipt. This # will be used to track the Change Request.*	*Return to Sender*	*Log number – system generated*
18	*ConditionalProvider*	*Indicates whether clarification is needed on the Change Request.*	*Return to Sender*	
19	*ConditionalProvider*	*Date clarification request sent to Initiator.*		
20	*ConditionalProvider*	*Date clarification due back from Initiator.*	*Return to Sender*	
21	*Mandatory Provider*	*Indicate status of proposed Change Request (i.e., clarification, validation, pending, etc)*		
22	*Mandatory Provider*	*Assign date when Change Request will appear on agenda.*	*Return to Sender*	
23	*Mandatory Provider*	*A soft date for implementation. Updated based on Candidate Release Package info.*		
24	*Mandatory Provider*	*Field that communicates who last updated the request.*		
25	*Mandatory Provider*	*Field that communicates when the last update occurred.*		
26	*Mandatory Provider*	*Change Request results captured from the Change Review meeting.*		
27	*Conditional Provider*	*Cancelled Change Request reasoning.*	*Return to Sender*	
28	*Conditional Provider*	*Concurrence with Change Request originating company. Show date of concurrence.*	*Return to Sender*	
29	*Conditional Provider*	*Change Request Escalation indication.*		
30	*Conditional Provider*	*Detailed description of the escalation considerations.*		
31	*Mandatory Provider*	*Indicate agreed release date from Project Release Plan.*		
32	*Mandatory Provider*	*Results of Internal Defect Validation*		

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

APPENDIX B: CHANGE REQUEST PRIORITIZATION FORM

Item #	*Change Request #*	*Description of Change Request*	*~~Customer~~CLEC Rankings*	*Comments*
		Title: ***Description:*** ***Process:*** ***System:*** ***Primary Area:*** ***LSOG Version:*** ***Initiator/Date:***	*Overall =* *Cust #1 =* *Cust #2 =* *Cust #3 =* *Cust #4 =* *Cust #5 =* *Cust #6 =*	
		Title: ***Description:*** ***Process:*** ***System:*** ***Primary Area:*** ***LSOG Version:*** ***Initiator/Date:***	*Overall =* *Cust #1 =* *Cust #2 =* *Cust #3 =* *Cust #4 =* *Cust #5 =* *Cust #6 =*	
		Title: ***Description:*** ***Process:*** ***System:*** ***Primary Area:*** ***LSOG Version:*** ***Initiator/Date:***	*Overall =* *Cust #1 =* *Cust #2 =* *Cust #3 =* *Cust #4 =* *Cust #5 =* *Cust #6 =*	

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

APPENDIX C: CMP PRIORITIZATION PROCESS EXAMPLE

Example: *Change Request E2 is prioritized highest. Since E3 and E5 are tied, they will be re-ranked and prioritized according to the re-ranking.*

Pre-order	*~~Customer~~CLEC #1*	*~~Customer~~CLEC #2*	*~~Customer~~CLEC #3*	*TOTAL*	*Average*
E1	*5*	*5*	*5*	*15*	*5*
E2	*1*	*2*	*1*	*4*	*1*
E3	*3*	*1*	*5*	*9*	*3*
E4	*5*	*3*	*4*	*12*	*4*
E5	*2*	*5*	*2*	*9*	*3*
E6	*4*	*4*	*3*	*11*	*4*

1232919/67817.150

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as existing or new gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities for local services provided by CLECs to their end users~~that are provided to CLECs.~~

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

FINAL MEETING NOTES

Wednesday, July 11 CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design Kickoff
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Bridgeline: 1-877-847-0638, passcode 780-4338# (confirmation: 4349718)

INTRODUCTION

Today Qwest kicked off the CLEC-Qwest effort to re-design the Change Management Process for the Qwest 14-state region. The kick-off was well attended by CLEC representatives, Service Providers (3rd Party Vendors) and a representative from the Colorado PUC via conference line or in person. Judy Schultz, Qwest Director-Change Management, welcomed the participants—refer to Attachment 1: Attendance Record.

Judy Schultz reviewed the agenda with the participants. Please refer to Attachment 2 for more details. In addition, Ms. Schultz introduced the team to Judy Lee. Ms. Lee is an outside consultant who will facilitate the 'drafting core team' working sessions.

Here are the highlights from today's kick-off meeting including discussions, decisions, issues and action items for each agenda item (see Attachment 3: Issues and Action Items Log).

RULES OF ORDER FOR THE RE-DESIGN WORKING SESSIONS

The participants agreed on the following **Meeting Ground Rules**: (see Attachment 4)

- Be respectful of other members
- One meeting—One voice
- Silence is concurrence
- Board it, leave it and move on
- Raise a problem, then propose solution
- Silent electronic devices
- No recording of conversations

Participants discussed the following <u>proposed</u> **Guiding Principles** for the working sessions: (refer to Attachment 5 for revised version)

<u>Proposed Guidelines</u>

- Collaborative work effort between CLECs and Qwest
- Operational level working sessions, not regulatory or legal
- Face-to-face work effort
- Participation open to Qwest's CLEC community
- Each CLEC may assign a representative, but not to exceed three per CLEC entity to allow more CLECs to participate at a 'manageable' working session
- CLECs may assign another CLEC entity to represent their interests
- "Team" provides a proposal to the CLEC community for review and acceptance
- "Team" provides status to the CLEC community at the monthly CICMP meetings until a final proposal is ready for review
- One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules

Discussion: Nightfire asked if the core team membership only consists of CLECs and Qwest representatives. Can a 3rd Party Vendor participate in the drafting effort? Nightfire expressed that 3rd Party Vendors represent many CLEC-clients and have more technical knowledge of the OSS interface changes. Rhythms asked if 3rd Party Vendors have 'voting' rights on behalf of their CLEC-clients, or just a 'voice' to re-design the process. Sprint stated that it was a good idea to include 3rd Party Vendors as a 'voice' in creating the re-designed process, however, Sprint wants to be able to 'vote' on its own behalf. Scindo Networks expressed concern that a 3rd Party Vendor is 'voting' on behalf of a CLEC. Scindo Networks stated that the Change Management Process is for the CLEC community, not the Vendor community, doing business with Qwest. Scindo Networks also agreed that a 3rd Party Vendor have a 'voice' but not a 'vote' on the process. SBC Telecom shared that other ILEC regions allow 3rd Party Vendors to 'vote' on behalf of CLEC-clients if a Letter of Authorization (LOA) is in place between the vendor and CLEC-client. Eschelon expressed that the knowledge of the 3rd Party Vendors is valuable and vendors should be welcomed as a 'voice' in creating the process, but 'voting' should be limited to the CLECs.

- ***DECISION:*** Participants asked that this discussion be deferred until the July 19th working session so that participants can discuss this issue within their organizations.
- ***DECISION:*** 3rd Party Vendors are welcomed to join the July 19th session via conference line
- ***ISSUE:***
    - **What role do 3rd Party Vendors play in this re-design effort?**
        - **A) 3rd Party Vendors are part of the core team to re-design the process, however, no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client (Process=Yes, Vote=No)**
        - **B) 3rd Party Vendors are allowed to 'voice' and 'vote' as any CLEC (Process and Vote=Yes)**
        - **C) 3rd Party Vendors are excluded from the core team (Process and Vote=No)**
- ***ACTION: On July 19th we will conclude this discussion and decide on one of the above scenarios.***

Discussion: Participants were concerned with the 'face-to-face' requirements for the working sessions. All participants wanted to attend the working sessions, but expressed concerns about limited resources and traveling costs. Rhythms supported face-to-face sessions and asked CLECs if other CLECs can represent them in this effort. All participants understood the effectiveness of face-to-face sessions, but would like Qwest to consider conference line capabilities for those who can't attend in person.

- ***DECISION:*** Qwest will make available a conference line for those who want to participate in the working sessions, but can't attend in person. Core team members (or their backup representative) will make every effort to attend in person.

Proposed Structure

- Working sessions are in 3-day intervals with 7 working days off for both parties to work issues and action items.
- Working sessions to be scheduled before or after Qwest's monthly CICMP meetings to mitigate additional travel needs, wherever possible
- Qwest hosts working sessions
- Qwest facilitates working sessions and captures outcome of discussions and decisions to be shared with the CLEC community at the CICMP meetings
- Qwest handles all logistics including packaging of Change Management Process framework (document)

Discussion: Participants were concerned about the 3-day intervals for the working sessions due to limited resources. Eschelon asked if CLECs could host some of the working sessions.

- ***DECISION:*** Working sessions are in 2-day intervals and twice a month. One working session should be scheduled around the monthly CICMP meeting to cut travel costs.
- ***DECISION:*** CLECs are welcome to host working sessions in the September timeframe. (Note: Travel arrangements need to be made for July and August sessions quickly to take advantage of discount fares and hotel room availability. Therefore, Qwest will host the July and August sessions in Denver, Colorado.)
- ***ACTION: The Core Team will decide on the location for September working sessions at a later date.***

Proposed Outcomes

- Agreement on Guiding Principles and Working Session Structure
- Agree on membership of 'team'
- Timeline to draft proposal and review/discuss with entire CLEC community to finalize Change Management framework

Discussion: Participants wanted to know what the communications process will be to keep the CLEC community informed about discussions and decisions from the working sessions.

- ***DECISION:*** Qwest will set up a link on the web site (tentatively called CICMP Re-design) which will include a write-up of notes, issues and action items from each working session and an agenda for the next set of working sessions.

OBJECTIVES OF THE RE-DESIGN PROCESS

Judy Schultz reiterated the objectives of the "drafting core team" as part of the Change Management working sessions. Participants provided comments and agreed to the objectives stated below.

Objectives:
Collaboratively develop a detailed revised Change Management Process and an implementation schedule for the revised process. The revised process will include the following key elements:

OSS Interfaces

- The Process shall address proposals for and notification of changes to OSS interfaces.
    - A 12-month Development View will be shared on a quarterly basis with the CLECs
    - The View will include all proposals that impact the CLECs
    - CLECs will have an opportunity to provide input to the View
- The application-to-application process will be improved to meet the intervals proposed at the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) with Issue 2233
- Qwest will conduct walk-throughs of initial (draft) requirements to provide an early understanding of the requirements and provide an opportunity for the CLECs to provide input before Qwest issues the final requirements.
- A process to introduce or retire interfaces will be developed.

Product/Process and Technical Publication

- The Process shall address product/process and technical publication changes to insure timely and high-quality notification. Walk-throughs will be conducted if deemed necessary by Qwest and the CLECs. CLECs will have an opportunity to provide input on the changes before the final notice is issued.

Exception Process

- An Exception process to allow changes to be implemented outside of the regular implementation intervals will be developed.

Escalation Process and Dispute Resolution Process

- The Escalation process will be revised to include a dispute resolution process.

Discussion: As suggested by CLECs, the "drafting core team" will use the OBF Issue 2233 version 2 framework as the baseline to develop a revised Change Management Process proposal for the Qwest region. Once a proposal is created, the Team will present the proposal to the entire CLEC community for review and acceptance.

- ***DECISION:*** The Core Team will use the OBF Issue 2233 version 2 proposal (refer to the last attachment as reference) as the baseline to develop a revised Change Management Process for Qwest.

WorldCom suggested that a helpful tool for the 'drafting core team' would be a single document that inserts CLEC comments on areas of improvement to Qwest's Change Management Process into the appropriate sections of the OBF Issue 2233 framework.

- ***ACTION: Qwest will create the single document for the July 19 session.***

Eschelon asked if CLEC comments could be posted on the web site. Other participants agreed with this suggestion. Qwest agreed to post CLEC comments on a web site. However, Qwest will first obtain permission from the CLECs who provided comments.

- ***ACTION: Qwest to seek clearance from individual CLEC to post their comments on the web site.***

PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS FOR WORKING SESSIONS

Participants agreed that the core team will go 'section-by-section' through the OBF Issue 2233 version 2 document to re-design Qwest's Change Management Process. Scindo Networks along with other CLECs asked if there is a better use of resources (OSS vs. product/process core team members) and suggested a staggered approach to work the process. For instance, one week of working sessions can be focused on the OSS process and another week the focus will be on product and process. AT&T expressed that OSS and product/process are so integrated that its representatives will be involved with discussions on OSS and product/process. Participants expressed a need for the core team to identify agenda items (elements) for each scheduled working session to allow CLECs to bring their appropriate subject matter experts.

- ***DECISION:*** Core team will use the OBF Issue 2233 version 2 proposal as the baseline, by working a section at a time.
- ***DECISION:*** Core team will first re-design the OSS process, then the Product & Process process.
- ***ACTION: Core team will schedule agenda items/elements for future working sessions.***

CORE TEAM MEMBERSHIP

Core team members to re-design Qwest's Change Management Process are as follows:

• Terry Wicks	Allegiance Telecom
• Terry Bahner	AT&T
• Donna Osborne-Miller	AT&T
• Sharon Van Meter	AT&T
• Gregory Johnston	Covad Communications
• Lynne Powers	Eschelon Telecom (ATI)
• Karen Clauson	Eschelon Telecom (ATI)
• Bill Littler	Integra Telecom
• Michelle Spague	McLeodUSA
• Marcia Lees	SBC Telecom
• Vince DeGarlais	Scindo Networks
• Sandy Evans	Sprint
• Liz Balvin	WorldCom
• Judy Schultz	Qwest
• Matt Rossi	Qwest
• Mark Routh	Qwest

SCHEDULED WORKING SESSIONS

Dates/Time	Location
Thursday, July 19 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617)	1801 California Street 21st Floor, Arkansas Conference Room Denver, CO (check in on 21st Floor)
Tuesday, August 7 and Wednesday, August 8 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617)	1801 California Street 21st Floor, Arkansas Conference Room Denver, CO (check in on 21st Floor)
Tuesday, August 14 and Thursday, August 16 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617)	1801 California Street 21st Floor, Arkansas Conference Room Denver, CO (check in on 21st Floor)
Wednesday, Sep 5 and Thursday, Sep 6 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617)	1801 California Street 21st Floor, Arkansas Conference Room Denver, CO (check in on 21st Floor)
Tuesday, Sep 18 and Thursday, Sep 20 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617)	1801 California Street 21st Floor, Arkansas Conference Room Denver, CO (check in on 21st Floor)

CLOSING REMARKS

Judy Schultz expressed appreciation to participants for their input. She informed the participants that Qwest will write up the notes from today's meeting. The draft notes will be sent via e-mail to participants by noon on Friday, July 13 for review. Participants were asked to provide Qwest with corrections, if any, via e-mail by noon on Tuesday, July 17th. Final notes will be shared with the entire CLEC community at the Wednesday, July 18 CICMP meetings and a separate mailing will also occur on the same day to the entire CLEC community.

The meeting concluded at 10:30 am Mountain Time

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Attendance Record
- Attachment 2: Agenda
- Attachment 3: Core Team Issues and Action Items Log
- Attachment 4: Meeting Ground Rules (final)
- Attachment 5: Guiding Principles (revised proposal)

ATTACHMENT 1

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Terry Wicks	Allegiance Telecom
Terry Bahner	AT&T
Donna Osborne-Miller	AT&T
Esther Scherer	AT&T
Ann Adkisson	AT&T
Mitch Menezes	AT&T
Letty Friesen	AT&T
Becky Quintana	Colorado PUC
Kim Tryggestad	Covad Communications
Gregory Johnston	Covad Communications
Lynne Powers	Eschelon Telecom (ATI)
Karen Clauson	Eschelon Telecom (ATI)
Kathy Stichter	Eschelon Telecom (ATI)
Bill Littler	Integra Telecom
Sam Yeung	KPMG Consulting
Rhonda Cheaney	Level 3
Jason Smith	Level 3
Michelle Hatcher	Level 3
Ron Weathers	McLeodUSA
Manuel Lozano	NightFire Software Inc.
Bob Carias	NightFire Software Inc.
Scott Simon	Premier Communications
Jean John	Quintessent Communications
Teresa Jacobs	Qwest
Debra Erickson	Qwest
Stephanie Greenhalgh	Qwest
Judith Schultz	Qwest
Matt Rossi	Qwest
Mark Routh	Qwest
Joe Ayala	Rhythms Links Inc.
Marcia Lees	SBC Telecom
Vince DeGarlais	Scindo Networks
Sandy Evans	Sprint
Liz Balvin	WorldCom
Anthony Mott	XO Communications
Marianne Good	XO Communications
Judy Lee	XTel Solutions Inc.

ATTACHMENT 2

Wednesday, July 11 CLEC-Qwest CMP Kickoff
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Bridgeline: 1-877-847-0638, passcode 780-4338# (confirmation: 4349718)

Agenda

• Introduction • Review Agenda • Introduce Facilitator (Judy Lee)	Judy Schultz

• Establish the rules of order for the re-design working sessions
  • Meeting Ground Rules
  • Guiding Principles for Working Sessions
	Judy Lee

• Establish the objectives of the re-design process • Discuss the feedback from the CLEC Community for Qwest's re-designed Change Management Process to include specific elements	Judy Schultz

• Determine how to proceed with re-design effort
  • Prioritize working sessions by those elements above, or
  • Use the OBF Issue 2233 version 2 framework
	Judy Lee

• Establish the schedule and agenda for future working sessions • Based on Guiding Principles and feedback from CLECs	Judy Lee
• Preview the elements for the first full day working session	Judy Lee
• Identify Team membership	Judy Lee

• Closing Remarks
• Next Steps
  • Qwest to write up notes from today's conference call and distribute to participants for review via email
  • All participants to review and provide Qwest with corrections, if any, via email
  • Final notes will be shared with CICMP forum participants (Wednesday, July 18)
  • Qwest will send final notes to entire CLEC community (by Wednesday, July 18 5pm MT)
• Adjourn
	Judy Schultz

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1	Issue	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Vendor	What role do 3rd Party Vendors play in this re-design effort? a) 3rd Party Vendors are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client [Process=Yes, Vote=No] b) 3rd Party Vendors are allowed to 'voice' and 'vote' as any CLEC in this re-design effort [Process and Vote=Yes] c) 3rd Party Vendors are excluded from the core team [Process and Vote=No]	Core Team	July 19	
1A	Action	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Vendor	Core Team to conclude discussion and participants to decide on one of the above scenarios	Core Team	July 19	
2	Action	July 11 Meeting	Baseline Document	Create a single document that inserts CLEC comments on areas for improvement in Qwest's CMP into the appropriate sections of the OBF 2233 version 2 framework	Judy Lee	July 19	A tool for the working session
3	Action	July 11 Meeting	Agenda Items	Schedule agenda items/elements for future working sessions	Core Team	July 19	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
4	Action	July 11 Meeting	Agenda Items	Decide the location for September working sessions	Core Team	August 8	
5	Action	July 11 Meeting	CICMP Redesign Web Site	Enhance the CICMP web site to include the CICMP Redesign information	Qwest—Mark Routh	July 19	
6	Action	July 11 Meeting	CLEC Comments	CLEC requested that Qwest posts all CLEC comments on the CICMP Redesign web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	July 19	
6A	Action	July 11 Meeting	CLEC Comments	Seek clearance in writing from individual CLECs to post their comments on the CICMP Redesign web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	July 13	

MEETING GROUND RULES

- Be respectful of other members
- One meeting - one voice
- Silence is concurrence
- Board it, leave it and move on
- Raise a problem, then propose a solution
- Silent electronic devices
- No recording of conversations

Guiding Principles for Working Sessions

REVISED PROPOSAL

Guidelines for the CLEC-Qwest team to develop a mutually agreed upon Change Management Process in Qwest's ILEC region

- Collaborative work effort between CLECs and Qwest
- Operational level working sessions, not regulatory or legal
- Face-to-face work effort (with conference bridge capabilities for any other CLEC participants)
- Participation open to Qwest's CLEC community
- Each CLEC may assign a representative, but not to exceed three per CLEC entity to allow more CLECs to participate at a 'manageable' working session
- CLECs may assign another CLEC entity to represent their interests
- 'Team' provides a proposal to the CLEC community for review and acceptance
- 'Team' provides status to the CLEC community at the monthly CICMP meetings until a final proposal is ready for review
- One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules

Structure

- Working sessions are in 2-day intervals, twice a month
- Working sessions to be scheduled before or after Qwest's monthly CICMP meetings to mitigate additional travel needs, wherever possible
- Qwest hosts working sessions (unless another Core Team member wishes to host the sessions in September)
- Qwest facilitates working sessions and captures outcome of discussions and decisions to be shared with the CLEC community at the CICMP meetings
- Qwest handles all logistics including packaging of Change Management Process framework (document)

Outcomes

- Agreement on Guiding Principles and Working Session Structure
- Agree on membership of 'team'
- Timeline to draft proposal and review/discuss with entire CLEC community to finalize Change Management framework
- Qwest will provide a web site link (called CICMP Re-design) to include working session notes, Issues and Action Items Log, Agenda and materials for next work session.

1232953/67817.150

FINAL MEETING NOTES—Revised on August 14, 2001

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
Thursday, July 19, 2001 Working Session

1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Junior Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Bridgeline: 1-877-847-0304, pass code 7101617# (confirmation: 4397137)

NOTE: The Final July 19, 2001 Meeting Minutes are revised to include the voting results on the 3rd Party Software Provider issue. The Core Team members requested for the inclusion of the voting results once Qwest obtained permission from those who voted on July 19. Qwest was able to obtain permission from the last voting CLEC Company on August 14, therefore the results are reflected in the Rules of Order section below.

Qwest developed DRAFT Meeting Notes last week for the July 19 re-design working session and asked participants for their input. These FINAL Meeting Notes include comments in italics from the participants, while others were incorporated into these notes without the need for highlighting.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team ("Team") and other participants met today to begin re-designing the Change Management Process—refer to Attachment 1 for the Attendance Record. The working session highlights are summarized below—see Attachment 2 for the July 19 Agenda.

The Team used the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Issue 2233 version 2 framework to discuss the sections on Introduction, Scope and Administration. Input from participants was encouraged and considered in what is now known as the redlined Change Management Process re-design framework (refer to the last attachment). We agreed that all participants will take these meeting notes and the redlined framework back to their respective organization to obtain feedback on the proposed language for the Introduction, Scope and Administration sections before the next working session. In addition, the participants can share their organization's feedback (issues, concerns and comments) with the rest of the Team at the next re-design working session. *[Eschelon Comment: Participants may have additional comments at or before the next re-design working session.]*

RULES OF ORDER FOR THE RE-DESIGN WORKING SESSIONS

Participants discussed the three scenarios below to determine the role of third party software provider ("3rd Party Software Provider"), if any, as participants to re-design Qwest's Change Management Process.

- A) 3rd Party Software Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however, no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client (Process=Yes, Vote=No)
- B) 3rd Party Software Providers are allowed to 'voice' and 'vote' as any CLEC (Process and Vote=Yes)
- C) 3rd Party Software Providers are excluded from the core team (Process and Vote=No)

AT&T Comment: AT&T requests rules defining a quorum be included in the minutes when a 'vote' is recorded.

- **DECISION:** The Team decided on another scenario (Scenario D) that 3rd Party Software Providers are invited to be part of the Core Team because of their valuable knowledge. But, the participants will not allow 3rd Party Software Providers to vote. However, if a Letter of Authorization ("LOA") is in effect with a specific CLEC-client for a specific

working session, the 3rd Party Software Provider can vote on behalf of that CLEC-client on a specific issue. *[Eschelon Comment: Please insert the record of the vote and who voted below. AT&T Comment: Requests "DECISION" be indicated as "D" and include the CLEC vote tally in the minutes. Qwest Response: Will seek written permission from participants who voted on this issue if results should be posted—to be discussed at the 8/7 re-design working session.]*

August 14, 2001 Revision: Qwest obtained permission from all voting CLEC Company today to publish the results of this vote. The voting results are as follows:

Voting Results on 3rd Party Software Provider Issue

Company	Scenario			
	A	B	C	D
Allegiance				X
AT&T	X			
Covad				X
Eschelon				X
Integra				X
Qwest			X	
SBC Telecom				X
Scindo	X			
Sprint				X
Verizon				X
WorldCom				X
ELI (joined after the vote)				
McLeod (absent on 7/19)				

- ***ACTION: Qwest to design a Letter of Authorization form to be used in the re-design working sessions. In addition, share the proposal with participants in the August 7 session for discussion on the process. [Action Item #1F]***
- ***ACTION: Qwest to design a Voting form to be used at these re-design sessions. [Action Item #1E]***
- ***ACTION: Define rules for a quorum when a 'vote' is required—scheduled for next working session. [Action Item #1G]***
- ***ACTION: Seek written permission from July 19 participants to post results of 3rd Party Provider voting—to be discussed at August 7 working session. [Action Item #1H]***

The modified Guiding Principles reflecting this decision is attached for your reference (see Attachment 3). *[AT&T Comment: Vince DeGarlais, Scindo Networks, provide an LOA to AT&T for the remaining July 19, 2001 meeting during his absence.]*

SCOPE

The OBF Issue 2233 version 2 framework limits the Change Management Process to those interfaces that Qwest offers to CLECs such as IMA-EDI and IMA GUI. In addition, Issue 2233 addresses LSOG (Local Service Ordering Guide) changes, not ASOG (Access Service Ordering Guide). Furthermore, this OBF subcommittee addresses local pre-order and ordering, but not maintenance/repair or billing. Maintenance/repair and billing are addressed at other ATIS forums. CLECs proposed that the Scope should include pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance/repair and billing systems and processes.

- **DECISION:** Participants agreed to discuss systems issues first and then go back and handle process issues later.
- ***ISSUE:*** Qwest expressed concern that the Scope needs further clarification as Qwest's definition of Scope and CLEC's definition of Scope differ. It was proposed that the Core team re-visit the Scope at a later date.
- ***ACTION: Qwest to provide a proposal regarding the Scope.*** *[Eschelon: Can we get Scope prior to the next meeting? Qwest Response: The re-visit of Scope is scheduled for a session in September. Qwest will provide their proposed language prior to the specific session to re-visit Scope.] [Action Item #18]*

MEETINGS

Qwest has committed to provide minutes from each CICMP meeting and ad hoc meetings/calls. The minutes will include summaries of the discussions and issues from the meeting. Each CLEC will designate a primary and alternate Change Management point-of-contact who will serve as the official designees for matters regarding the Change Management Process.

- **DECISION:** Qwest committed to provide minutes from each CICMP meeting and ad hoc meetings/calls.
- **DECISION:** Primary point-of-contact is the official voting member, and a secondary (alternate) point-of-contact can vote in the absence of the primary contact.

Participants expressed concern that Qwest meeting packages are filling up the capacity of mailboxes. *[Eschelon: Participants expressed concern that Qwest notices and meeting packages are too numerous and duplicative so that they do not provide meaningful notice.]* They suggested that Qwest notify CLECs via an e-mail notice that the meeting package is available on the web site for retrieval. The participants requested to discuss the larger notification issue at the next re-design working session.

- ***ACTION: Establish an agenda item for August 7 to discuss the notification process. [Action Item #20]***

PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS FOR WORKING SESSIONS

The Core Team decided that Qwest will host August and September working sessions in Denver, Colorado. The participants prioritized the following elements for future working session efforts—refer to Attachment 5 for date, location and topic of discussion for each working session.

- Performance Measurements (informational)
- Notification Process
- Distribution List
- Web Site
- Tracking (e.g., CR and RN status definition, naming convention)
- Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Changes)
- Prioritization
- Escalation Process and Dispute Resolution Process
- Introduction of OSS
- Retirement of OSS
- Production Support
- Release Requirements (e.g., Initial, walk-through, Comment Cycle, Final, Release Testing)
- Re-visit Scope
- Maintenance of CMP framework

- ***ACTION: Liz Balvin/Worldcom will provide the Core Team members with the latest PIDs for Change Management. [Action Item #19]***

CLOSING REMARKS

Judy Schultz closed the session. The participants audited the session:

What Worked	What Needed Improvement
• Having the PC Projection allowed in-person participants see real-time changes to the framework • Caroline Chong documenting changes to the framework on a real-time basis • Facilitation was effective • Availability of refreshments and lunch to keep the session moving • Material available prior to the working session allowed participants to prepare for the discussion • The 'right' people attended on behalf of Qwest • Participants were respectful of each other's point-of-view • Collaborative effort • Able to complete session early	• Need a bigger room with more working space • Stapled and hole-punched documents would be appreciated • Send an email if there are room changes

The working session concluded at 4:15 pm Mountain Time.

ADDITIONAL CLEC COMMENTS ON DRAFT 7/19 RE-DESIGN SESSION

AT&T Comment:

AT&T requests minutes to include all comments between Qwest and CLECS. This includes the dialogue between Qwest, Eschelon Telecom, and Integra Telecom concerning the pace of the re-design process. Qwest stated they wish to move forward in an expedient fashion while Eschelon and Integra indicated the CLECS will not be rushed into making decisions or changes that affect the change management process.

Eschelon Comment:

Overall: These draft notes are more of an expanded log than actual minutes of the discussion. Minutes should include discussion with a record of which CLEC raised the issue. Such minutes should be more complete and useful. For example Qwest expressed concern regarding covering more issues in each session. CLECs responded that the schedule is already aggressive and consuming many resources. Eschelon pointed out that CLECs have been asking for CICMP process improvements for more than a year. While pleased that Qwest has now turned its' attention to improving the process, Eschelon said that it must be done with consideration for all party's limited resources.

Eschelon Comment:

Please include contact information for all participants. [***ACTION: Pending Qwest's response.***]
[Action Item #21]

Eschelon Comment:

Working Session agenda—Include topics for discussion under Issues and Action Items
[ACTION: Include discussion items on agenda under Issues and Action Items]
[Action Item #22]

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Attendance Record
- Attachment 2: July 19 Agenda
- Attachment 3: Guiding Principles (revised)
- Attachment 4: Core Team Issues and Action Items Log
- Attachment 5: Schedule—CMP Re-design Working Sessions
- Attachment 6: Redlined Change Management Process re-design framework (July 19 version)

ATTACHMENT 1

ATTENDANCE RECORD

CORE TEAM

Terry Wicks	Allegiance Telecom
Terry Bahner	AT&T
Donna Osborne-Miller	AT&T
Sharon Van Meter	AT&T
Gregory Johnston	Covad Communications
Lynne Powers	Eschelon Telecom (ATI)
Karen Clauson	Eschelon Telecom (ATI)
Kathy Stichter	Eschelon Telecom (ATI)
Bill Littler	Integra Telecom
Sam Yeung	KPMG Consulting
Rick Woodhouse	KPMG Consulting
Marcia Lees	SBC Telecom
Vince DeGarlais	Scindo Networks
Sandy Evans	Sprint
Liz Balvin	WorldCom
Wendy Green	Qwest
Judith Schultz	Qwest
Matt Rossi	Qwest
Mark Routh	Qwest

ABSENT CORE TEAM MEMBER

Michelle Spague	McLeodUSA

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Becky Quintana	Colorado PUC
Peder Gunderson	Electric Light Wave
Mark Powell	Accenture

FACILITATOR

Judy Lee	XTel Solutions Inc

ATTACHMENT 2

Working Session to Negotiate
A Modified Change Management Process

Thursday, July 19, 2001
9 am to 5 pm Mountain Time
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor Junior Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
(Please check in at the door)

Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304 passcode: 7101617 (hit #)

AGENDA

TOPIC	Lead
Introduction	Judy Schultz, Qwest Director – Change Management Judy Lee, Facilitator
Discussion and Status • Guiding Principles for Working Sessions • Issues and Action Items	All
Discussion: Change Management Process (Process: Discuss section-by-section using the OBF Issue 2233 version 2 framework) • **Introduction** • **Scope** • **Out-of-Scope** • **Administration—Managing the Change Management Process**	All
Develop Project Plan • Timeline for working sessions, review and discuss proposal with CLEC community, comment cycle, finalize framework • Agenda for subsequent working sessions	All
Next Session • Determine discussion items for the next working session • Determine what supporting material is needed for the next session	All

Guiding Principles for Working Sessions
REVISED

Guidelines for the CLEC-Qwest team to develop a mutually agreed upon Change Management Process in Qwest's ILEC region

- Collaborative work effort between CLECs and Qwest
- Operational level working sessions, not regulatory or legal
- Face-to-face work effort (with conference bridge capabilities for any other CLEC participants)
- Participation open to Qwest's CLEC community
- Each CLEC may assign a representative, but not to exceed three per CLEC entity to allow more CLECs to participate at a 'manageable' working session
- CLECs may assign another CLEC entity to represent their interests
- 'Team' provides a proposal to the CLEC community for review and acceptance
- 'Team' provides status to the CLEC community at the monthly CICMP meetings until a final proposal is ready for review
- One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules
- CLEC may have a 3rd Party Software Provider vote on the re-designed Process on their behalf if a Letter of Authorization is in effect for the re-design sessions on a specific issue.

Structure

- Working sessions are in 2-day intervals, twice a month
- Working sessions to be scheduled before or after Qwest's monthly CICMP meetings to mitigate additional travel needs, wherever possible
- Qwest hosts working sessions (unless another Core Team member wishes to host the sessions in September)
- Qwest facilitates the working sessions and captures outcome of discussions and decisions to be shared with the CLEC community at the CICMP meetings
- Qwest handles all logistics including packaging of Change Management Process framework (document)

Outcomes

- Agreement on Guiding Principles and Working Session Structure
- Agree on membership of 'team'
- Timeline to draft proposal and review/discuss with entire CLEC community to finalize Change Management framework
- Qwest will provide a web site link (called CICMP Re-design) to include working session notes, Issues and Action Items Log, Agenda and materials for next work session.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1A	Issue	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider Role	What role do 3rd Party Providers play in this re-design effort? a) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client [Process=Yes, Vote=No] b) 3rd Party Providers are allowed to 'voice' and 'vote' as any CLEC in this re-design effort [Process and Vote=Yes] c) 3rd Party Providers are excluded from the core team [Process and Vote=No] d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client with an LOA [Process=Yes, and Vote=Yes for CLEC client, Vote = No for themselves]	Core Team	CLOSED 7/19	DECISION: d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process; however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client if a Letter of Authorization is in effect. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.
1B	Action	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider	Core Team to conclude discussion and participants to decide on one of the above scenarios	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED in July 19 meeting.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1C	Issue	July 19 meeting	Voting	Can a CLEC represent another CLEC on Voting for CMP re-design process?	Core Team	CLOSED 7/19	DECISION: Yes, if a Letter of Authorization is in place for a specific session and on specific issues. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.
1D	Issue	July 19 meeting	Voting	If a CLEC or core team member is absent, how do we handle the vote?	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: It is a CLEC's responsibility to have a same CLEC backup, or a LOA in place with an alternate.
1E	Action	July 19 meeting	Voting	Create a standard voting form	Qwest -- Mark Routh	August 7	Qwest to share with August 7 participants.
1F	Action	July 19 meeting	LOA	Create a standard for LOA for topic, meeting, and date to be used during the re-design sessions.	Qwest - Judy Schultz	August 7	Qwest to share with August 7 participants.
1G	Action	July 19 meeting	Voting	Define rules for a quorum when a 'vote' is required	Core Team	August 7	Discuss at August 7 working session
1H	Action	July 19 meeting	Voting	Seek written permission from July 19 participants if 3rd Party Provider voting results can be posted on the web site as part of the FINAL meeting notes.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	August 7	Discuss at August 7 working session to seek written permission
2	Action	July 11 Meeting	Baseline Document	Create a single document that inserts CLEC comments on areas for improvement in Qwest's CMP into the appropriate sections of the OBF 2233 version 2 framework	Judy Lee	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: A tool for the working session is posted on the web site
3	Action	July 11 Meeting	Agenda Items	Schedule agenda items/elements for future working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: See schedule of working sessions on the web site

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
4	Action	July 11 Meeting	Working Session Location	Decide the location for September working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: All sessions will be hosted by Qwest and held in Denver, CO
5	Action	July 11 Meeting	CICMP Redesign Web Site	Enhance the CICMP web site to include the CICMP Redesign information	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED. See CICMP web site for "CICMP Redesign"
6	Issue	July 19 meeting	CICMP Redesign Material	What is the process to share CMP redesign material with the CLEC community?	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Draft minutes and material will be shared with the core team participants for input. Afterwards, Qwest will finalize the minutes and post on the web site. CLECs will be notified about the posting. DECISION: Participants decided that Qwest should issue a notice referring CLECs to the web site for meeting minutes, handouts and agenda for next meeting. The handouts will not be attached to the notice.
7A	Action	July 11 Meeting	Post CLEC Comments on Web Site	CLEC requested that Qwest post all CLEC comments on the CICMP Redesign web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED Matrix is posted on the web site
7B	Action	July 11 Meeting	Written Permission to Post CLEC Comments	Seek clearance in writing from individual CLECs to post their comments on the CICMP Redesign web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 13	COMPLETED CLECs that provided comments allowed Qwest to post on web site

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
8	Action	July 19 meeting	Notice and Distribution Lists	Provide guidelines for CLEC notifications and distribution list - Ease-of-use - Comment/Reply process including web site option to comment - Contact information - Identify limitations on contact information: proprietary, open-to-participant, or open-to-all	Core Team	August 7	Agenda item for August 7 working session
9	Action	July 19 meeting	Re-name	Do we need to rename CMP to CICMP? Rename co-provider to CLEC?	Core Team	August 7	DECISION: Qwest will rename co-provider to CLEC and provider to Qwest. PENDING: Renaming CMP to CICMP
10	Action	July 19 meeting	ATIS	Research what ASOG activities are being worked on at ATIS.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	August 7	
11	Action	July 19 meeting	ATIS	Identify guidelines for Billing, Maintenance/Repair and ASOG.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	August 7	
12	Action	July 19 meeting	Distribution Package	Determine what to include in the CICMP meeting distribution packages.	Core Team	August 7	Discussion item at August 7 working session
13	Action	July 19 meeting	Walk-On Agenda Items	Add walk-on item to the end of each CICMP meeting agenda.	Qwest—Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: Qwest will add walk-on items to the end of each agenda, as appropriate, starting with the August 15 meeting
14	Action	July 19 meeting	CICMP Web Site	Review CICMP web-site and suggest potential changes and guidelines	Core team	August 7	Discussion item at August 7 working session

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
15	Action	July 19 meeting	Naming	Review CR and RN naming convention going forward – categorized, date-stamped, etc.	Core team	August 7	Discussion item at August 7 working session
16	Action	July 19 meeting	Notice	Research source and readability of event notifications (software applications)	Qwest— Mark Routh	August 7	
17	Action	July 19 meeting	Qwest Comments on MATRIX	Include Qwest comments on the MATRIX (OBF Issue 2233 with CLEC Comments)	Qwest— Judy Schultz	August 7	
18	Issue	July 19 meeting	Scope	Qwest expressed concern that the Scope needs further clarification. Qwest will propose language to re-visit the Scope at a future session.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	September 20	
19	Action	July 19 meeting	PIDs	Liz Balvin/Worldcom will provide the Core Team members with the latest PIDs for Change Management.	Liz Balvin/ Worldcom	August 7	
20	Action	July 19 meeting	Guidelines for Notification Process	Discuss guidelines for the notification process at the next session.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	August 7	Discussion item at August 7 working session
21	Issue	July 19 meeting	Contact Information	Eschelon requested that contact information for all participant be included on the CICMP Re-design web site	Qwest— Judy Schultz	August 7	Request from review of 7/19 DRAFT meeting notes and material
22	Action	July 19 meeting	Discussion Items under Issues/ Action Item Log	Eschelon requests to include on the agenda topics for discussion under Issues and Action Items Log	Qwest— Judy Schultz	August 7	Request from review of 7/19 DRAFT meeting notes and material

ATTACHMENT 5

SCHEDULED WORKING SESSIONS

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Thursday, July 11—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Kickoff
Thursday, July 19—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Introduction • Scope • Administration—Managing the Change Management Process
Tuesday, August 7 and Wednesday, August 8 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO (Qwest will greet you on the 23rd Floor)	• Performance Measurements (informational) • Notification Process • Distribution List • Web Site • Tracking (e.g., CR and RN status definition, naming convention)
Tuesday, August 14 and Thursday, August 16 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street (to be announced) Denver, CO	• Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Change) • Prioritization • Exception Process (added by Qwest after 7/19 meeting)
Wednesday, Sep 5 and Thursday, Sep 6 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street (to be announced) Denver, CO	• Escalation Process and Dispute Resolution Process • Introduction of OSS • Retirement of OSS • Production Support
Tuesday, Sep 18 and Thursday, Sep 20 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street (to be announced) Denver, CO	• Release Requirements (e.g., Initial, Walk-through, Comment Cycle, Final, Release Testing) • Re-visit Scope • Maintenance of CMP framework

Note: Agenda will include standing items—Issue/Action Items, Review redlined document and Set/Confirm agenda for next working session

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

~~NEED REFERENCE TO CUSTOMER/PROVIDER NEGOTIATIONS~~
~~**OBJECTIVE – TO GAIN CONSENSUS ON A NATIONAL GUIDELINE PROCESS FOR THE FOLLOWING TOPICS**~~

[Note: Qwest has agreed to change the following terms: Customers to CLEC and Provider to Qwest]

INTRODUCTION [need to readdress at a later date]—Action Item #18

The Change Management Process (CMP) is a method used by ~~customers~~ Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs) and ~~a local service provider~~Qwest to initiate, communicate, prioritize, schedule, test and implement ~~enhancements~~ changes to ~~provider~~Qwest Operational Support Systems (OSS), ~~interfaces~~ which directly or indirectly impact a CLEC~~.~~

The change management process creates a framework for meetings in which changes to the ~~provider~~Qwest's OSSs and their business rules may be introduced or discussed. The ~~customer's~~ CLEC's Point Of Contact (POC) may request ~~interface~~ changes for future consideration by submitting a Change Request Form to ~~the provider's~~Qwest's POC.

SCOPE [need to readdress at a later date]—Action Item #18

- **OSS (Pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance/repair, billing)**
- **LSOG**
- **VSOG (ISSUE 2037)**
- **ASOG**

This document defines the processes for change management of manual processes and electronic ~~interfaces~~ systems relative to pre-order, ~~and pre~~ order, **provisioning, maintenance/repair, and billing** functions. ~~Interface impact is defined as changes to field content or format, or changes in the business rules used to govern field population.~~ This includes national guideline changes, e.g., LSOG, as well as ~~provider~~ Qwest specific ~~interface~~ process and system changes. Changes include new functionality, enhancements to existing functionality, introduction/retirement of ~~interfaces~~ processes and systems and maintenance activities affecting production defects. System impacts include changes to field content or format, or changes in the business rules used to govern field population, etc. ~~Desired changes should be submitted to the appropriate ATIS Forum.~~

The scope~~is~~ includes any ~~pre-order, order~~ business rules, ~~interface~~ system testing and maintenance that impact ongoing and future technical and operational processes, and changes that alter the

relationship in the manner in which ~~the provider~~Qwest and ~~customer~~ a CLEC do business.

ADMINISTRATION

MANAGING THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Change Management POC

~~The provider~~Qwest and each ~~customer~~ CLEC will designate primary and secondary change management POC(s) who will serve as the official designees for matters regarding this CMP. ~~P~~The primary POC is the official voting member, and a secondary (alternate) POC can vote in the absence of the primary POC. There can be more than one secondary POC for each ~~customer~~CLEC.

~~Customers~~ CLECs and ~~provider~~ Qwest will exchange POC information including items such as:

- Name
- Title
- Company
- Telephone number
- E-mail address
- Fax number
- Cell phone/p~~P~~ager number

Change Management POC List

Primary and secondary ~~customer~~CLEC POCs should be included in ~~the provider~~Qwest maintained distribution list. It is the ~~customer's~~ CLEC's responsibility to notify ~~the provider~~Qwest of any POC changes. The list will be made available to all participating ~~customers~~CLECs with permission of the POCs.

Preferred Method of Communication

The preferred method of communication is e-mail with supporting information posted to the web-site. (deferred to action item)

MEETINGS

Change Management meetings will be conducted on a regularly scheduled basis, at least on a monthly basis. Meeting participants can choose to attend meetings in person or participate by conference call~~, when available~~.

~~The CMP team consists of representatives from the customers (or their authorized agents) and the provider. This team~~Meetings are held ~~meets~~ to review, prioritize, manage the implementation of ~~scheduled~~ process and system changes ~~releases~~ ~~-~~and ~~make recommendations for~~address change management requests.
~~The provider~~Qwest will review the status of all applicable change requests. The meeting may also include discussions of ~~the provider's~~Qwest's development view.

CLEC's request for additional agenda items and associated materials should be submitted to the provider at least five (5) business days by noon (MST) in advance of the meeting. ~~The provider~~Qwest is responsible for distributing the agenda and associated meeting materials at least ~~seven~~ three (~~7~~3) business ~~calendar~~ days by noon (MST) in advance of the meeting. ~~The provider~~Qwest will be responsible for preparing, maintaining, and distributing meeting minutes ~~notes~~. Attendees with any walk-on items should bring materials of the walk-on items to the meeting.

All attendees, whether in person or by phone, must identify themselves and the company they represent.

~~Emergency or special~~Additional meetings may be held at the request of ~~the provider~~Qwest or any qualified ~~customer~~ CLEC (as defined in this document). ~~Emergency~~ M~~m~~eeting notification must contain an agenda plus any supporting meeting materials. These meetings should be announced at least ~~two~~ five (~~2~~5) business days prior to their occurrence. Exceptions may be made for emergency situations.

Meeting Materials (Distribution Package) for Change Management Meeting

Meeting materials should include ~~but are not limited to,~~ the following:

- Meeting Logistics
- Minutes from previous meeting
- Agenda
- Change Requests and responses
  - New/Active

  - Updated
  - Log
- Issues, Action Ite~~e~~ms Log and associated statuses
- Release ~~Notice~~Summary~~,~~ 12 Month Development View
- Monthly System Outage Report
- Any other material to be discussed

~~The provider may distribute printed copies of the previously provided meeting materials at the change management meeting. The provider will review the status of all applicable change requests. The meeting may also include discussions of the provider's development view.~~

Meeting ~~Notes~~ Minutes for Change Management Meeting

~~The provider~~Qwest will take ~~notes~~minutes. ~~Meeting notes should include, but are not limited to, the following:~~

~~Current status of change requests and release notices~~
~~Issues, Action items and statuses~~
- ~~Attendees, Company represented~~

~~The provider~~Qwest will summarize discussions in meeting minutes and include any revised documents such as Issues, Action items and statuses.

~~Notes~~ Minutes should be distributed to meeting participants for comments or revisions no later than ~~seven~~ five (~~7~~5) ~~calendar~~ business days by noon (MST)after the meeting. ~~Customer~~CLEC comments should be provided within two (2) business days by noon (MST). ~~Updated notes~~Revised minutes, if ~~customer~~CLEC comments are received ~~provided~~, should be distributed within nine ~~eleven~~ (~~11~~9) ~~calendar~~ business days by noon (MST) after the meeting.

Provider Web Site

To facilitate access to CMP documentation, ~~the provider~~Qwest will maintain CMP information on its web site. At a minimum, the web site should contain:

- Current version of ~~the provider~~Qwest CMP document
- Test case scenarios
- A log of ~~customer~~CLEC and provider change requests and associated statuses
- ~~Issues, Action items logs and associated statuses~~Meeting materials (distribution package)

- Meeting ~~notes~~minutes
- Release announcements and associated requirements
- Business rules based on national guidelines and provider's specific requirements
- Contact list

(Action Item List item)

- ESCALATION PROCESS

- RELEASE SCHEDULE
- PRIORITIZATION

MANAGED CHANGES

CHANGE TO EXISTING INTERFACES

~~Customer~~CLEC Originated Change

Changes may include new functionality and/or enhancements to existing interface functionality.

Provider Originated Change

~~Customer~~CLEC impacting changes may include new functionality and/or enhancements to existing interface functionality.

Industry Guideline Change

Changes associated with telecommunications industry guidelines using a national implementation timeline. These may include new functionality and/or enhancements to existing interface functionality. Either ~~the provider~~Qwest or the ~~customer~~CLEC may initiate the change request. These guidelines are industry defined by the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS).

Regulatory Change

Changes mandated by regulatory or legal entities, such as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), a state commission/authority, or state and federal courts. Regulatory changes are not voluntary but are requisites to comply with newly passed legislation, court rulings or regulatory requirements. These may include new functionality and/or enhancements to existing interface functionality. Either the ~~customer~~CLEC or ~~the provider~~Qwest may initiate the change request.

Tracking Change Requests

~~The provider~~Qwest will assign a tracking number to each change request and track changes to each change request. Tracking will be accomplished via a change request log.

- INTRODUCTION OF A NEW INTERFACE
- RETIREMENT OF EXISTING INTERFACES

IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGE

CHANGE REQUEST INITIATION PROCESS

REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

Draft Interface Release Requirements

Prior to implementing a new interface or a change to an existing interface, ~~the provider~~Qwest will notify ~~customer~~CLECs of the draft release requirements.

Notifications for regulatory changes are based on applicable law and / or regulatory rules. If no time frame for implementation of the mandated change is specified, it shall be subject to the CMP timeline as described below. ~~Customer~~CLECs and provider will, where possible, make every effort to encourage regulators to follow the CMP timeline for mandated changes.

Time lines for industry guidelines related changes are based on ~~customer~~CLEC / provider agreement in conjunction with the rollout of national guidelines, subject to any overriding regulatory obligations. (See 2233a3.doc for graphic depiction of the following time lines)

Notification for ~~customer~~CLEC impacting releases, which may include ~~customer~~CLEC initiated requests, provider initiated requests and regulatory changes, will typically occur at least 73 calendar days prior to implementing the release. This notification may include draft business rules. ~~Customer~~CLECs have fifteen (15) calendar days from the initial publication of draft documentation to provide comments / questions on the documentation.

Technical specifications will be produced and distributed to ~~customer~~CLECs 66 calendar days prior to implementation.

Final business rules and technical specifications for the release will be published at least 45 calendar days prior to implementation.

For ~~customer~~CLEC impacting releases, more or less notification may be provided based on severity and the impact of the changes in the release. For example, ~~the provider~~Qwest can implement the change in less than 45 calendar days with ~~customer~~CLEC concurrence.

Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements

The notification will contain:

- Written summary of change(s)
- Target time frame for implementation
- Draft business rules or access instructions

Walk Through of Draft Interface Release Requirements

If requested by one or more ~~customer~~CLECs within fourteen (14) calendar days of receiving the initial release requirements, ~~the provider~~Qwest will sponsor a walk through with the appropriate internal subject matter experts. ~~The provider~~Qwest will hold this walk through no later than fifty-two (52) calendar days prior to the scheduled implementation.

~~Customer~~CLEC's Comments on Draft Interface Release Requirements

Any ~~customer~~CLEC comments or requests for clarification must be submitted in writing to ~~the provider~~Qwest.

Provider Response to Comments

~~The provider~~Qwest will review and respond with written answers to all ~~customer~~CLEC issues, comments and/or concerns within seven (7) calendar days. The answers will be shared with all ~~customer~~CLECs, unless the ~~customer~~CLEC's question(s) is marked proprietary. Any changes that may occur as a result of the responses will be distributed to all ~~customer~~CLECs in the same notification.

Content of Final Business Rules and Technical Specifications Release Requirements

~~Customer~~CLEC responses to the draft business rules and technical specifications may be incorporated into the final release requirements.

The final release documentation should include the following:

- Summary of changes
- Final complete documents
- Release date

- **TRAINING**

TESTING

- INTERFACE TESTING

PRODUCTION SUPPORT

POST IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT

Either ~~the provider~~Qwest may detect or the ~~customer~~CLEC may report a situation involving production interfaces. These problems typically affect the ability to exchange and process transactions between the ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest. Problems are evaluated according to ~~customer~~CLEC impact in the following manner:

Production Stopped:

Interface Unusable – An interface problem that results in a totally unusable interface requiring emergency action. Transactions cannot be exchanged or processed between ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest and manual work-arounds are not feasible. The correction of the problem is considered essential to continued operation. The ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest should dedicate resources to expedite the resolution.

Provider Detected
- Initial communication = 1 hour
- Status = Every 2 hours until problem corrected

~~Customer~~CLEC Reported
- Notify provider
- Initial communication = 1 hour
- Status = Every 2 hours until problem corrected

Production Degraded:

Interface Affecting - An interface problem that requires a work-around(s) on the part of the ~~customer~~CLEC or ~~the provider~~Qwest. The correction of the problem is considered critical to continued operation. It does not stop production, but affects key applications.

Provider Detected
- Initial communication = 4 hours
- Status = As appropriate, at least weekly until a correction date is established.

~~Customer~~CLEC Reported
- Notify provider
- Initial communication = 4 hours
- Status = As appropriate, at least weekly until a correction date is established.

APPENDIX

- DEFINITION OF TERMS
- GLOSSARY OF TERMS
- CHANGE REQUEST FORM AND CHECKLIST
- CHANGE REQUST PRIORITIZATION FORM
- CMP PRIORITIZATION PROCESS EXAMPLE

1232926/67817.150

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
Tuesday, August 7 and Wednesday, August 8, 2001 Working Sessions

1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Bridgeline: 1-877-847-0304, pass code 7101617#

NOTE: These FINAL meeting minutes were circulated to the CMP Re-design Core Team Members in attendance for their review and comments are noted in italic throughout the minutes.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team (Team) and other participants met August 7th and 8th to continue with the redesign effort of the Change Management Process. Following is the write-up of the discussions, action items, and decisions made in the working sessions. The attachments to these meeting minutes are as follow-

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Attendance Record
- Attachment 2: August 7 and 8th Agenda
- Attachment 3: Guiding Principles (revised)
- Attachment 4: Letter of Authorization (LOA)
- Attachment 5: Core Team Members Expectations/Responsibilities
- Attachment 6: Core Team Voting Tally Form
- Attachment 7: Core Team Issues and Action Items Log
- Attachment 8: Schedule—CMP Re-design Working Sessions
- Attachment 9: Redlined Change Management Process re-design framework (August 8th version)

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting began with introductions of the meeting attendees. Judy Lee reviewed the two day agenda and asked for input regarding any changes or modifications to the material. Lee's review of the agenda included the verification that attendees had received the Performance Measure documentation submitted by Liz Balvin-WorldCom. All attendees indicated receipt of the material and there were no questions or modifications to the agenda items to be covered.

Judy Lee began the meeting with a review of the Guiding Principles last revised at the July 19th working session. Lee wanted to make certain that there was a common understanding of one of the items, "One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules." Sharon VanMeter-ATT questioned why the clarification on the voting was necessary. Lee stated that this principle was meant to allow the CLEC community to vote on items that were to be presented to Qwest so that the CLECs could present a single voice to Qwest whenever possible. Liz Balvin-WorldCom asked why it is not a single vote for all members including Qwest, and that this appeared to make the effort less collaborative. Terry Wicks-Allegiance Telecom stated that votes would work to determine which options the CLEC community wanted Qwest to pursue, and that Qwest would need to determine which proposals could be supported in advance of the CLEC vote. There was discussion regarding the need to have other avenues to resolve impasse issues, including escalation and dispute resolution. Judy Lee stated that the CLEC community could request a caucus at any time during the meetings to clarify their positions without Qwest participation. Judy Schultz-Qwest reiterated the point that Qwest may not be able to implement a certain proposal due to operations, systems, expense considerations/limitations, etc. and that Qwest hoped to be able to negotiate solutions suitable to any proposal submitted. Schultz did say she hoped CLEC caucusing would be limited so that Qwest could remain involved in as many discussions as

possible to make certain Qwest clearly understood the underlying CLEC needs to ensure satisfactory resolution whenever possible. Larry Gindlesberger-Covad and Sandy Evans-Sprint pointed out that in their experiences with other ILECs that caucusing was minimal and there were few times when the ILEC was not involved. Liz Balvin-WorldCom stated change management needed to be a 100% collaborative process and that negotiation was key. She was concerned the vote clarification would require the CLECs to meet or caucus without Qwest. She went on to say that WorldCom needed to demonstrate to Qwest and each CLEC the importance of certain proposals, and that WorldCom had to abide to the vote outcome. Sharon Van Meter-ATT stated it appeared that the vote clarification would result in a CLEC vs Qwest rather than collaborative environment, and that ATT did accept majority rule even if the majority rule did not support ATT's position. Terry Wicks-Allegiance brought up the scenario where there may be four options being considered for a proposal and being voted on, but Qwest could only implement three of the four options. The CMP CLECs could either vote on one of the three options being considered, or determine that the only viable option was the option Qwest could not support. At that point the CLECs could caucus to determine if the proposal was at impasse and initiate escalation/dispute resolution processes. Liz Balvin-WorldCom stated all CLECs also have the option to negotiate directly with Qwest for initiatives critical to their businesses. Discussion then followed regarding how other ILECs manage voting processes. Terry Wicks-Allegiance, Larry Gindlesberger-Covad, and Sandy Evans-Sprint discussed that the vote clarification presented by Judy Lee matched voting procedures implemented in other ILECs they are working Change Management with.

- **DECISION:** The Team decided to clarify voting and add language describing impasse issues (See Attachment 3 – Guiding Principles).
    - **Original language -** "One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules". **Revised language -** "One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules in CLEC community and one vote for Qwest, making every effort to reach consensus".
    - **New principle** – "Impasse issues will be resolved using the established Escalation and Dispute Resolution Processes". *[AT&T COMMENT: What are the established Escalation and Dispute Resolution Processes?]*

George Gravilis-Scindo asked if any participant could bring up a proposal at the CMP monthly meeting. It was stated that a proposal could be raised at the meeting, but that it could not be voted on until a subsequent meeting since proposals that are to be voted on are provided to CMP members in advance of the meeting.

Following a break, Judy Schultz reviewed the draft Letter of Authorization (LOA) that Qwest had developed for designating representatives at CMP re-design meetings when the CLEC CMP-redesign members could not be in attendance. The LOA was designed to assign voting privileges on specific issues to ensure clear understanding of the authorized representative's role at that particular meeting. The LOA is required for each working session and is not effective beyond the specified working session. LOAs are to be submitted to Judy Schultz-Qwest. There was no discussion regarding the LOA. (See Attachment 4)

Judy Lee then began discussion of what was meant by quorum for the CMP-re-design meetings. Quorum was defined as 51% of Core Team members, however there were questions regarding how core team membership was determined and how it could change. The discussion centered around how a core team member might be added, or dropped depending on their involvement. Larry Gindlesberger-Covad stated that CLECs should be able to join as core team members during the entire time that CMP-redesign is in effect. Terry Wicks-Allegiance made the point that core team membership did represent a commitment of time, and that it was necessary to clearly define core team membership for determining a quorum. There was no disagreement with the comments regarding commitment. Judy Lee led the development of Core Team Members Expectations/Responsibilities (Attachment 5). This attachment outlines requirements for being a

Core Member, and will be used to determine quorum. If quorum is not established at a working session, voting will be delayed to the next working session.

- **DECISION:** The Team defined Core Team Member and developed a new outline document to describe Expectations/Responsibilities (See Attachment 5 – Re-design Core Team Members Expectations/Responsibilities).

The team then went on to discuss the July 19th Final Meeting minutes. Kathy Stichter-Eschelon pointed out that Attachment 6, "Redlined Change Management Process re-design framework (July 19 version)", did not contain the agreed to footnote information defining "including". Judy Lee stated that would be corrected going forward.

Judy Lee then began review of the July 19th Final Meeting Notes - Attachment 4: Core Team Issues and Action Items Log. Mark Routh-Qwest provided a description of the Voting Tally Form that will be posted on the Wholesale CMP web site indicating how each entity voted on proposals. The form is a five column table (Attachment 6) and will be posted to the Wholesale CMP website. A vote was taken at the July 19th meeting (See July 19th Final Meeting Notes), and all attendees, except SBC Telecom, gave approval to post that Vote Tally to the Wholesale CMP website. Qwest will contact SBC Telecom to gain approval for posting the Vote Tally from the July 19th meeting.

- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 1 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #1H.

The Team then discussed changing the name of CICMP (Co-Provider Industry Change Management Process) to CMP (Change Management Process). Sandy Evans-Sprint stated that Qwest was the only ILEC using the term CICMP and that all other ILECs were simply using CMP. It was determined that CMP should be recommended at the general meeting on August 15, 2001.

- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 8 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #9.

Judy Schultz-Qwest reviewed the request that the Change Management Process (CMP) be expanded to include ASR-ASOG activities. Schultz explained that although there was a local services aspect to ASR-ASOG, it was developed to provide services to interexchange carriers, wireless carriers, and did not have any developed Change Management Process (CMP). Liz Balvin-WorldCom pointed out that CLECs did use ASR-ASOG for ordering interconnection trunks, and CLECs will need Qwest to develop information that will outline what systems are used for local services ordering. Liz Balvin-WorldCom stated that systems such as HEET and EXACT have some functionality that affects local services and that a description of that functionality is needed. George Gavrilis-Scindo asked what systems were used for local services and Liz Balvin-WorldCom read the list from Qwest documentation. Judy Schultz-Qwest explained that Qwest has 400+ systems in use and that Qwest wants to focus on the CLEC functional requirements rather than specific systems to ensure meeting their needs through the CMP.

- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 3 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #17B.

Liz Balvin-WorldCom provided an information-only review on Performance Indicator Definitions (PIDS) that had been distributed earlier to the re-design team. These PIDs cover areas such as release notifications, outages and test environments.

Judy Lee began discussion on guidelines for Notification Process, Distribution List, Web Site, and CICMP meeting distribution package. Mark Routh-Qwest reviewed a list of release notification categories that could be used to catalog notifications. Sharon Van Meter-ATT saw value in the categories and recommended they be used as a starting point. Liz Balvin-WorldCom stated she would like to have subcategory descriptions and it was agreed that as the Core Team develops subcategories, descriptions would be beneficial. Judy Schultz-Qwest recommended that as the

Core Team develop naming conventions it is important to keep in mind all the types of notifications moving forward. There continued to be discussion regarding the primary categories and four were identified; Systems, Products, Process, and Network. Kathy Stichter-Eschelon and Leilani Hines-WorldCom emphasized the need to have single source documentation to minimize duplication and ensure accuracy, and that the issue date and effective date were important for tracking. George Gavrilis-Scindo asked what category outage notification fell into. It was stated each of the four categories could have outages as a subcategory. Discussion shifted to notifications on Change Requests (CRs) and Terry Wicks-Allegiance stated Release Notifications should cross-reference the Change Request. Sharon Van Meter-ATT wanted notifications to include the attachments for review as well as the link to the website where the notification was posted. Discussion continued regarding potential naming conventions for documentation and how the notifications and documentation could be named and numbered, including revision information so the most recent information could be accessed. Kathy Stichter-Eschelon recommended that an existing notification be mocked up with recommended naming conventions. Liz Balvin-WorldCom and Sharon Van Meter-ATT stated that the impact to other CLECs was significant and Judy Schultz-Qwest agreed that this item would be brought before the general CMP meeting on August 15th. Discussion then shifted to the management of distribution lists. Many of the CLECs would like Qwest to direct notifications to different contacts based on the category of the notification. Notifications are being migrated to an automated mailout tool and Qwest agreed to explore the options for managing distribution lists. George Gavrilis-Scindo asked if outage notifications could generate a pager message and it was determined that this capability was already in place. Wholesale CMP Web Site design was the next discussion item. George Gavrilis-Scindo requested that the web site design include adequate search tools and easy sub category navigation. He asked Qwest to investigate the use of drop-down menus for category and subcategory navigation. The team recognized that the simultaneous work on naming conventions would have a significant impact on web site design. It was requested that Qwest rename the CRs on the web site to include a title. Matt-Rossi-Qwest and Mark Routh-Qwest agreed to implement that change for the posted CRs. There was also a request from Kathy Stichter-Eschelon to place a calendar of event on the web site. Mark Routh-Qwest agreed to make that available by September 5th. Judy Schultz-Qwest explained that there was significant work being undertaken by Jarby Blackmun-Qwest related to notifications and web site design and operations, and that a follow-up with Jarby would take place to determine what capabilities were being implemented. *[AT&T COMMENT: Please make note that KPMG participated with the discussion around the renaming of the notifications.]*

The assigned action items related to the above items are as follow:

- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13B.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13C.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13D.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13E.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13F.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13G.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #14D.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 9 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-CLOSED, Item #14E.

The next day, August 8th, began with an agenda review by Judy Lee. Items to be discussed included an overview of a call Judy Schultz-Qwest had the previous evening with Jarby Blackmun regarding website design and notifications. The group agreed to review the red-lined Change

Management Process Re-design Framework (See Attachment 9) and to set the agendas and times for future re-design working sessions.

Judy Schultz-Qwest then provided an overview of the call that she had the previous evening with Jarby Blackmun-Qwest. Judy explained that the earlier discussion of developing subcategories for the web site would need to be expedited because Blackmun was finalizing changes to the existing design of the web site and it would represent significant work to add changes at a later date. The attendees agreed to that all participants would develop recommendations for subcategories and present them at the working session scheduled for August 14th. Judy Schultz-Qwest also discussed the request from George Gavrilis-Scindo for drop down menus. Schultz stated that drop down menus were hard to update but that Qwest could implement the capability to show all subcategory links for each category. Gavrilis and others agreed that would meet the need. There had been discussion in earlier sessions regarding receiving duplicate information and Schultz-Qwest provided an example of when a duplicate notification could be generated. The example was of the introduction of a new product by Qwest, and how there could be two notices generated within the four categories of Systems, Product, Process, and Network because a new product would include Product and Process notifications. There was discussion about combining Product and Process but the team agreed that they would rather keep Product and Process separate for internal distribution efficiencies and that the duplication did not warrant combining Product and Process into a single category. The four main categories were again reviewed and agreed to. Those categories are Systems, Product, Process, and Network. George Gavrilis-Scindo asked if there were a schedule for the completion of the website and notification process modifications. Judy Schultz-Qwest agreed to get that schedule and provide it at the next working session. Schultz went on the explain that as team members developed subcategories for the web it was important to think through how detailed the subcategories become because of the need to balance ease of navigation within the web site. Attendees received copies of the notifications that are being generated by the automated mailout tool. Jim Maher-Qwest stated there was flexibility with using the suffix in the document number as a tool for further defining the notification content. All attendees were able to see the examples of the naming conventions currently being provided through the automated mailout tool provided by correspondence received by Terry Wicks-Allegiance and Sandy Evans-Sprint. George Gavrilis-Scindo asked for clarification on who was making recommendations on the naming convention subcategories. Judy Schultz-Qwest stated that all parties should bring recommendations to the working session on August 14.

- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13B.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13C.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13F.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #14C.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 3 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #14D.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 3 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #14F.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 8 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-CLOSED, Item #8.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 8 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-CLOSED, Item #13A.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 9 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-CLOSED, Item #14B.

Discussion then moved to reviewing the distribution package that is provided at general CMP monthly meetings. Matt Rossi-Qwest asked the attendees if a log of the Change Requests (CRs) was sufficient to avoid providing a copy of each detailed CR to avoid large amounts of paperwork.

Terry Wicks-Allegiance stated that the CR log would be sufficient if it contained enough of the information from the CR so there was no confusion. Terry Wicks went on to ask if the pertinent status information from the CR could be pasted into the CR log. Kathy Stichter-Eschelon stated the individual CRs were not necessary if the log captured CR title, description, history and status. There was no disagreement from the team. Stichter went on to ask if Release Notifications (RNs) could reference the CR that resulted in the RN. Judy Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest was developing an Access database that could track CRs and provide reports similar to the log. Schultz stated she would bring an example of the report to the August 14th re-design meeting. Sandy Evans-Sprint then questioned why the responses to CRs were not included in the CR document. Evans stated that responses to CRs are posted into a separate column on the Wholesale CMP CR website, which required going to one document to see resolution rather then the CR itself, and it made the work much more cumbersome. Evans recommended that the CRs include responses *[Sprint COMMENT: "and that the responses are sent to the originator via e-mail, not posted on the web site"]*. Terry Wicks-Allegiance supported incorporating the responses into the CR document, so that the CR document became the single source for all activity including status and resolution response. Matt Rossi-Qwest stated that the responses were usually detailed and outlined in a format that could not be provided in the CR form. Rossi explained it would appear as text without some of the formatting available on the separate response document. It was agreed that a single source document had more advantages even with the formatting limitations. Sandy Evans-Sprint agreed to bring in an example of documentation she would like to see implemented. Matt Rossi-Qwest then stated that the log would include CRs that have been closed. Judy Schultz-Qwest stated it was important that the closed items are reviewed and agreed to at the CMP general monthly meetings. Closed CRs will be reviewed at the September 19th general meeting.

- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 1 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #11B.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 1 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #11C.

The next item covered Attachment 9: "Redlined Change Management Process re-design framework." Kathy Stichter-Eschelon presented clarifications and additional language that was discussed, modified and incorporated into the document (See Attachment 9). Key items discussed included defining how long documents are maintained on the Wholesale CMP website as working documents, and how long documents are maintained in the archives. Mark Routh-Qwest said all documentation was archived and could be retrieved even if it is no longer on the web site. Routh went on to say that all documentation posted to the website since its inception is still there. Given that some of the documentation is outdated Routh recommended that all open documentation remain posted, and those closed items be moved to the archive section of the website for 12 months. Terry Wicks-Allegiance asked if the team would consider 18 months for retention in the archive section of the website and everyone agreed. Terry Bahner-ATT asked if the website could incorporate date stamps on the pages and links so the users could see when the last update occurred. Matt Routh-Qwest and Judy Schultz-Qwest agreed to look into the feasibility of date stamping items on the website.

- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13E.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 2 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #13G.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 8 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-CLOSED, Item #11A.

Judy Lee then reviewed the agenda items to be covered at the next re-design working session on August 14 and 16. Agenda items include review of the August 7-8 final meeting minutes, the prioritization process, exception process, and issues/actions. Sandy Evans-Sprint stated the proposed timeline for the Qwest exception process was lengthy, and she would bring an example of an exception process she found more acceptable. Qwest stated that the August 7-8 re-design draft meeting minutes would be available by 12:00 PM MDT, August 10th, with revisions from the

team to Matt Rossi by 12:00 PM MDT, August 13th. Final meeting minutes to be posted on the Wholesale CMP website by August 14th.

- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 4 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-OPEN, Item #29.
- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 11 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-CLOSED, Item #26.

Judy Lee then asked attendees what worked and what didn't work with the following input.

What Worked	What Needed Improvement
• Much better conference room • Real time updates on the PC projection screen • Open honest discussion • No impasse • Collaborative • Positive atmosphere • Time slots worked • Proposed framework language changes were written out in advance • Having information on how other ILECs manage CMP	• Speakerphone participants had a difficult time hearing some of the discussion

Judy Lee then reviewed re-design working session schedules going forward. Working sessions are scheduled through September and it was recommended by Sharon Van Meter-ATT and agreed to by the team that additional working session scheduling should be proposed through December and then cancelled if not needed. (See Attachment 8: Schedule—CMP Re-design Working Sessions)

Judy Schultz-Qwest stated there were a number of improvements that Qwest could implement without waiting for the re-design negotiation effort to complete. Schultz proposed bringing these improvements to the CMP general monthly meetings for concurrence on implementation. Sharon Van Meter-ATT requested that any recommendations be identified by source, i.e., Re-design team, individual CLEC, Qwest, etc. so that the CMP general meeting attendees can know where the improvement recommendation came from. Judy Schultz-Qwest agreed with that request.

- **ACTION ITEM:** See Attachment 7, page 11 - Core Team Issues and Action Items Log-CLOSED, Item #25.

Attachment 1

CMP Re-Design Team Attendees

August 7 and 8 Working Session

Last Name	*First Name*	*Company*	*Email*	*Phone*
Team Members				
Bahner	Terry	AT&T	Tbahner@att.com	303-298-6149
Balvin	Liz	WorldCom	liz.balvin@wcom.com	303-217-7305
Evans	Sandy	Sprint	sandra.k.evans@mail.sprint.com	913-433-8499
Gavrilis	George	Scindo Networks	Gtgavrilis@scindonetworks.com	720-528-4193
Gindlesberger	Larry	Covad Communications		
Gunderson	Peder	Electric Light Wave	peder_gunderson@eli.net	360-816-3429
Hines	LeiLani	WorldCom	LeiLani.Jean.Hines@wcom.com	303 217-7340
Maher	Jim	Qwest	Jxmaher@qwest.com	303-896-5637
Rossi	Matt	Qwest	mrossi@uswest.com	303-896-5432
Routh	Mark	Qwest	mrouth@uswest.com	303-896-3781
Schultz	Judy	Qwest	jmschu4@qwest.com	303-965-3725
Stichter	Kathy	Eschelon Telecom	klstichter@eschelon.com	612-436-6022
Thiessen	Jim	Avista	jthiessen@avistacom.net	509-444-4089
Van Meter	Sharon	AT&T	svanmeter@att.com	303-298-6178
Wicks	Terry	Allegiance Telecom	terry.wicks@algx.com	469-259-4438
Facilitator				
Lee	Judy	Xtel Solutions, Inc.	soytofu@pacbell.net	650-743-8597
Others				
Yeung	Sam	KPMG Consulting	shuyeung@kpmg.com	212-954-6351
Nobs	Christian	KPMG Consulting		
LeMon	Lynne	Qwest	Llemon@qwest.com	303-965-6321

Attachment 2

Working Session to Negotiate
A Modified Change Management Process

Tuesday, August 7 and Wednesday, August 8, 2001
9 am to 5 pm Mountain Time
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
(You will be greeted at the door)

Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304 passcode: 7101617 (hit #)

AGENDA—Updated

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction	Judy Schultz, Qwest Director – CMP Judy Lee, Facilitator
Discussion and Status	All
• Issues and Action Items: – Generic Letter of Authorization for re-design working sessions – Define rules for a Quorum when a 'vote' is required – Re-name CMP to CICMP • Feedback on July 19 discussed elements: – Introduction – Scope – Administration – Guiding Principles – Other	
• Performance Measurements (informational)	Liz Balvin
• Guidelines for Notification Process, Distribution List, Web Site, and CICMP meeting distribution package	All
• Tracking (e.g., CR and RN status definition, naming convention)	All
Next Session • Determine discussion items for the next working session • Determine what supporting material is needed for the next session	All
Quick Fix Implementation	Judy Schultz
Closing Remarks	Judy Schultz
Adjourn	

Attachment 3

Guiding Principles for Working Sessions
REVISED—August 8, 2001

Guidelines for the CLEC-Qwest team to develop a mutually agreed upon Change Management Process in Qwest's ILEC region

- Collaborative work effort between CLECs and Qwest
- Operational level working sessions, not regulatory or legal
- Face-to-face work effort (with conference bridge capabilities for any other CLEC participants)
- Participation open to Qwest's CLEC community
- Each CLEC may assign a representative, but not to exceed three per CLEC entity to allow more CLECs to participate at a 'manageable' working session
- CLECs may assign another CLEC entity to represent their interests
- Any participant may provide a proposal or counter proposal.
- One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules in CLEC community and one vote for Qwest, making every effort to reach consensus.
- Impasse issues will be resolved using the established Escalation and Dispute Resolution Processes.
- CLEC may have a 3rd Party Software Provider vote on the re-designed Process on their behalf if a Letter of Authorization is in effect for the re-design sessions on a specific issue.

Structure

- Working sessions are in 2-day intervals, twice a month
- Working sessions to be scheduled before or after Qwest's monthly CMP meetings to mitigate additional travel needs, wherever possible
- Qwest hosts working sessions (unless another Core Team member wishes to host the sessions in September)
- Qwest facilitates the working sessions and captures outcome of discussions and decisions to be shared with the CLEC community at the CMP meetings
- Qwest handles all logistics including packaging of Change Management Process framework (document)

Outcomes

- Agreement on Guiding Principles and Working Session Structure
- Agree on membership of 'team'
- Timeline to draft proposal and review/discuss with entire CLEC community to finalize Change Management framework
- Qwest will provide a web site link (called CICMP Re-design) to include working session notes, Issues and Action Items Log, Agenda and materials for next work session.
- 'Team' provides a proposal to the CLEC community for review and acceptance
- 'Team' provides status to the CLEC community at the monthly CMP meetings until a final proposal is ready for review

Attachment 4

Letter of Authorization (LOA)

I, _____ [CLEC representative], am an authorized agent of

_____ [CLEC name]. _____ [CLEC name]

[*check one of the following*]

☐ (a) has a contractual relationship with _____ [3rd Party Provider] pursuant to which _____ [3rd Party Provider] performs _____ [describe services] for _____ [CLEC name].

OR

☐ (b) desires to authorize _____ [2d CLEC name] to vote on its behalf at a CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign meeting as described below.

On behalf of _____[CLEC name], I hereby authorize _____ [3rd Party Provider or 2d CLEC name]'s representative to vote on behalf of _____ [CLEC name] regarding the following issue at the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign meeting that will be held on _____ [date], if a vote is taken on this issue at that time [insert detailed description of issue]:

_____

_____

_____

Date: _____.

_____
Signature

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
CLEC Name

Attachment 5

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

Core Team

(as of August 7, 2001)

Expectations/ Responsibilities

- Dedicated resource to negotiate a new CMP process.
- Core Team Members can be added at any time understanding the roles and responsibilities of a Core Team Member.
- Core Team Members must commit to participate either in person, via conference call, or by LOA in each working session.
- Core Team Membership will be revoked if 3 consecutive working sessions are missed.
- Core Team member will not be allowed to vote on any issue in which they did not participate.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

PROPOSAL

The **purpose** of a 'vote' is to obtain consensus among the CLEC Core Team members on a specific issue. This form serves as a collective record of the individual vote. In addition, the results of the tally may be submitted with the working session meeting minutes as an attached document. However, each CLEC who voted may decline permission to publish his/her company voting result (see next page).

Voting Tally Form

CMP Re-design Working Session:	
Date of Vote:	

Issue:	
Scenario A:	
Scenario B:	
Scenario C:	
Scenario D:	

CLEC Company	Core Team Member	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	Scenario D
Allegiance Telecom	Wicks, Terry				
AT&T	Osborne-Miller, Donna				
Avista	Thiessen, Jim				
Covad Communications	Gindlesberger, Larry				
Electric Light Wave	Gunderson, Peder				
Eschelon Telecom	Powers, Lynne				
Integra Telecom	Littler, Bill				
McLeodUSA	Sprague, Michelle				
SBC Telecom	Lees, Marcia				
Scindo Networks	Gavrilis, George				
Sprint	Evans, Sandy				
WorldCom	Balvin, Liz				

Voting Tally Form—continued

CMP Re-design Working Session:	
Date of Vote:	

Participating CLEC

CLEC Company	Participating CLEC	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	Scenario D

CLEC Consensus:	

The following CLEC/s do not give Qwest permission to publish his/her company voting result.

CLEC Company	CLEC Name

Attachment 7

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1H	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Seek written permission from July 19 participants if 3rd Party Provider voting results can be posted on the web site as part of the FINAL meeting notes.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	~~August 7~~ Extended – August 14	Participating CLECs (SBC Telecom not available) provided permission for Qwest to include voting results as part of the FINAL 7/19 Meeting Minutes PENDING: Qwest will follow up with SBC Telecom for permission to publish its voting result.
9	Action	July 19 meeting	Re-name	Do we need to rename CMP to CICMP? Rename co-provider to CLEC?	Core Team	August 15	DECISION (7/19): Qwest will rename co-provider to CLEC and provider to Qwest. DECISION (8/7): Name change recommendations will be presented at 8/15 CMP Meeting
11B	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	Qwest to provide a sample of the "report" containing information for CMP meeting.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	August 14	
11C	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	CLECs have a need to see one document/report containing all information (single point of reference). For example, CR/RN Logs need to include originator, title, description, history and status, so that individual CRs and RNs do not need to be included in Monthly Meeting package. CRs also need to include actual response/s and decision.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	Proposal to CMP Re-design Core Team for review; target rollout to CLEC community at the 9/19 Monthly CMP meeting.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
13B	Action	August 7 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Can Qwest display new naming convention on the CICMP web site (CRs and RNs)—e.g., Ability to click category and receive next sub category?	Qwest – Judy Schultz/ Core Team	August 14	Close on proposals for sub-category under the 4 categories (Systems, Product, Process and Network)
13C	Action	August 7 meeting	CICMP Web Site	Provide location (link) where all notification documents are kept – Wholesale web site	Qwest – Judy Schultz	August 14	
13D	Action	August 7 meeting	CICMP Web Site	Add English title to all new and existing CRs posted on the CICMP web site	Qwest – Mark Routh Matt Rossi	September 5	
13E	Action	August 8 meeting	CICMP Web Site	Qwest to determine how to time-stamp each web site page (whenever the page is updated on the web site)	Qwest— Judy Schultz	August 14	
13F	Action	August 8 meeting	CICMP Web Site	Develop timeframe to roll-out web site and mail-out process	Qwest – Judy Schultz	August 14	8/14 Re-design working session: Invite Jarby Blackmun to share timeline and screen shots of the web site to re-design team. If possible, Jarby to provide a demo of the web site page/s.
13G	Action	August 8 meeting	CICMP Web Site	Re-visit the redlined CMP framework element, "Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site" at a later working session.	Core Team	Sep 20	Re-visit this element to insure all items are addressed in the re-designed CMP framework.
14C	Action	Updated August 7 meeting (7/19)	Notification Process	Using proposed naming convention, build a matrix of possible combinations for RN titles.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
14D	Action	August 7 meeting	Notification Process	Take existing system, product and process notification and modify to match proposed naming convention to obtain one single naming convention for all notifications	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
14F	Action	August 8 meeting	Notification Process	Provide proposals for sub-categories (e.g., Product Family) under each notice category (Systems, Product, Process and Network) and links.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	August 14	Web Site modification rollout is dependent on proposal for sub-categories—see Item 14C.
16	Action	July 19 meeting	Qwest Comments on MATRIX	Include Qwest comments on the MATRIX (OBF Issue 2233 with CLEC Comments)	Qwest— Judy Schultz	August 14	
17A	Issue	July 19 meeting	Scope	Qwest expressed concern that the Scope needs further clarification. Qwest will propose language to re-visit the Scope at a future session.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	September 20	
17B	Issue	August 7	Scope	Describe Qwest's position for systems and functionality supported in the current CMP process (i.e., EXACT, HEET)	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
17C	Action	August 7	Scope	Dialogue on introduction and scope to seek input from CLECs to prepare for Qwest's proposal on September 20th	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	Agenda item for September 5
23	Action	August 7 meeting	Upcoming Event Calendar	Provide an "up coming" events page on the CICMP web site that includes all monthly meetings, re-design meetings and any other interim ad hoc meetings/calls	Qwest – Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	September 5	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
24	Action	August 8 meeting	CMP POC List	Establish a CMP POC list (primary and alternate POC) and post on web site	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	Provide team with status on 8/14
27	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Re-design Location	Determine location for the October, November and December re-design working session.	Core Team	August 16	Qwest has tentatively reserved meeting rooms in Denver, Colorado
28	Action	August 8 Meeting	Monthly CMP Meeting	Move December meeting to 12/12	Qwest—Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	August 17	December re-design working session is dependent on this change.
29	Action	August 8 Meeting	Exception Process	Share other ILEC Exception Process with 8/14 working session participants to be used as a base.	Sprint—Sandy Evans	August 14	Other Core Team members to bring samples too.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--CLOSED

CLOSED ISSUES and ACTION ITEMS (items in BLUE were closed at the last working session)

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1A	Issue	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider Role	What role do 3rd Party Providers play in this re-design effort? a) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client [Process=Yes, Vote=No] b) 3rd Party Providers are allowed to 'voice' and 'vote' as any CLEC in this re-design effort [Process and Vote=Yes] c) 3rd Party Providers are excluded from the core team [Process and Vote=No] d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client with an LOA [Process=Yes, and Vote=Yes for CLEC client, Vote = No for themselves]	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process; however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client if a Letter of Authorization is in effect. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1B	Action	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider	Core Team to conclude discussion and participants to decide on one of the above scenarios	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED in July 19 meeting.
1C	Issue	July 19 meeting	Voting	Can a CLEC represent another CLEC on Voting for CMP re-design process?	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: Yes, if a Letter of Authorization is in place for a specific session and on specific issues. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.
1D	Issue	July 19 meeting	Voting	If a CLEC or core team member is absent, how do we handle the vote?	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: It is a CLEC's responsibility to have a same CLEC backup, or a LOA in place with an alternate.
1E	Action	July 19 meeting	Voting	Create a standard voting form	Qwest -- Mark Routh	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Voting form created and will be included in the draft meeting minutes for 8/7-8/8 session
1F	Action	July 19 meeting	LOA	Create a standard for LOA for topic, meeting, and date to be used during the re-design sessions.	Qwest - Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: LOA presented, discussed and agreed upon during the 8/7 Meeting.
1G	Action	July 19 meeting	Voting	Define rules for a quorum when a 'vote' is required	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: - Quorum is defined as 51% of the present Core Team Members - Majority vote by present Core Team Members carries the decision
2	Action	July 11 Meeting	Baseline Document	Create a single document that inserts CLEC comments on areas for improvement in Qwest's CMP into the appropriate sections of the OBF 2233 version 2 framework	Judy Lee	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: A tool for the working session is posted on the web site

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
3	Action	July 11 Meeting	Agenda Items	Schedule agenda items/elements for future working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: See schedule of working sessions on the web site
4	Action	July 11 Meeting	Working Session Location	Decide the location for September working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: All sessions will be hosted by Qwest and held in Denver, CO
5	Action	July 11 Meeting	CICMP Redesign Web Site	Enhance the CICMP web site to include the CMP Redesign information	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED. See CICMP web site for "CICMP Redesign"
6	Issue	July 19 meeting	CMP Redesign Material	What is the process to share CMP redesign material with the CLEC community?	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Draft minutes and material will be shared with the core team participants for input. Afterwards, Qwest will finalize the minutes and post on the web site. CLECs will be notified about the posting. DECISION: Participants decided that Qwest should issue a notice referring CLECs to the web site for meeting minutes, handouts and agenda for next meeting. The handouts will not be attached to the notice.
7A	Action	July 11 Meeting	Post CLEC Comments on Web Site	CLEC requested that Qwest post all CLEC comments on the CICMP Re-design web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Matrix is posted on the web site

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
7B	Action	July 11 Meeting	Written Permission to Post CLEC Comments	Seek clearance in writing from individual CLECs to post their comments on the CICMP Redesign web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 13	COMPLETED: CLECs that provided comments allowed Qwest to post on web site
8	Action	July 19 meeting	Notice and Distribution Lists	Provide guidelines for CLEC notifications and distribution list - Ease-of-use - Comment/Reply process including web site option to comment - Contact information - Identify limitations on contact information: proprietary, open-to-participant, or open-to-all	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Established four categories for notices to facilitate notification efficiency.
10	Action	July 19 meeting	ATIS	Research what ASOG activities are being worked on at ATIS.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: ATIS is not developing a Change Management process that includes ASRs. Related to Issue #17B.
11A	Action	July 19 meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	Determine what to include in the CMP meeting distribution packages.	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	COMPLETED: REDLINED CMP re-design framework will reflect results of discussion.
12	Action	July 19 meeting	Walk-On Agenda Items	Add walk-on item to the end of each CMP meeting agenda.	Qwest—Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: Qwest will add walk-on items to the end of each agenda, as appropriate, starting with the August 15 meeting
13A	Action	July 19 meeting	CICMP Web Site	Review CICMP web-site and suggest potential changes and guidelines	Core team	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Included in 8/8 redlined CMP framework

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
14A	Action	July 19 meeting	Notification Process	Discuss guidelines for the notification process at the next session.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Refer to re-worded Action #14C.
14B	Action	August 7 meeting	Notification Process	Explore functionality and capability of the "mail out" tool used for Product/ Process notifications.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 8	COMPLETED: "Mail-outs" are not on the web site—pending closure on the categories and sub-categories from Core Team (see Item #13B)
14E	Issue	August 8 meeting	Notification Process	What category (i.e., 4 category) should be used to notify CLECs of the introduction of a new product? Should Qwest send one notice addressing product and process, or two separate, but redundant notices (i.e., one for Product and another for Process but with the same content)?	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: Qwest to send a Product notice and a separate Process notice with the same content information—redundant notices with different category and name on the subject line.
15	Action	July 19 meeting	Notice	Research source and readability of event notifications (software applications)	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: System outages and event notifications are now being released in a "doc" format.
18	Action	July 19 meeting	PIDs	Liz Balvin/Worldcom will provide the Core Team members with the latest PIDs for Change Management.	Liz Balvin/ Worldcom	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Liz Balvin sent PIDs on July 20th
19	Issue	July 19 meeting	Contact Information	Eschelon requested that contact information for all participant be included on the CICMP Re-design web site	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Request from review of 7/19 DRAFT meeting notes and material COMPLETED: All contact information now included on the Re-Design page on the CICMP web site

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
20	Action	July 19 meeting	Discussion Items under Issues/ Action Item Log	Eschelon requests to include on the agenda topics for discussion under Issues and Action Items Log	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Request from review of 7/19 DRAFT meeting notes and material COMPLETED: Updated 8/7-8/8 agenda
21A	Action	August 7 meeting	Core Team	Establishing CMP Re-Design Core Team Membership	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Reviewed Core Team membership
21B	Action	August 7	Core Team— Meeting Quorum	Establish Core Team Quorum at the beginning of each working session	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: Quorum determination will be added to the agenda and be determined by attendance at each working session
22	Issue	August 7 meeting	Core Team— Expectations	Define Expectations of Core Team Membership	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: Core Team Expectations/ Responsibilities: - Dedicated resource to negotiate a new CMP process. - Core Team Members can be added at any time understanding the roles and responsibilities of a Core Team Member. - Core Team Members must commit to participate either in person, via conference call, or by LOA in each working session. - Core Team Membership will be revoked if 3 consecutive working sessions are missed. - Core Team member will not be allowed to vote on any issue in which they did not participate.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log--CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
25	Issue	August 8 meeting	Quick Hit Fix	How should Qwest introduce some Change Management Process changes ahead of completing the re-design CMP effort?	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: Qwest will review any proposals with the CMP re-design Core Team members before communicating at a Monthly CMP Meeting. During the Monthly CMP Meeting, Qwest will let meeting attendees know who participated in designing the Quick Hit proposal. "Quick Hit Fix" will be a standing item for the Monthly CMP Meeting agenda.
26	Action	August 8 meeting	Meeting Minutes Review	What is the timeline for DRAFT and FINAL 8/7-8/8 Meeting Minutes and material?	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: – DRAFT Meeting Minutes and materials (by Fri, 8/10 9am MT) – Distribute DRAFT to 8/7-8/8 re-design session participants for review (by Fri, 8/10 Noon MT) – Participants provide Matt Rossi with corrections/additions (Mon, 8/13 Noon MT) – FINAL Meeting Minutes and materials to be distributed and posted on CMP Re-design web site (by Tuesday, 8/14)

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Schedule of Working Sessions

Note: Agenda will include standing items—Review Core Team participation, Issue/Action Items, Review redlined document, Final Meeting Minutes from the previous session, and Set/Confirm agenda for the next working session

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Thursday, July 11—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Kickoff
Thursday, July 19—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Introduction • Scope • Administration—Managing the Change Management Process
Tuesday, August 7 and Wednesday, August 8—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Performance Measurements (informational) • Notification Process • Distribution List • Web Site • Tracking (e.g., CR and RN status definition, naming convention)
Tuesday, August 14 and Thursday, August 16 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1005 – 17th Street, 1st Floor, Junior Board Room Denver, CO	• Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Change) • Prioritization • Exception Process (added by Qwest after 7/19 meeting)
Wednesday, Sep 5 and Thursday, Sep 6 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Escalation Process and Dispute Resolution Process • Introduction of OSS • Retirement of OSS • Production Support
Tuesday, Sep 18 and Thursday, Sep 20 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street (to be announced) Denver, CO	• Release Requirements (e.g., Initial, Walk-through, Comment Cycle, Final, Release Testing) • Re-visit Scope • Maintenance of CMP framework

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Schedule of Working Sessions

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Tuesday, Oct 2 and Wednesday, Oct 3 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	TENTATIVE 1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on Systems or begin Product and Process discussions
Tuesday, Oct 16 and Thursday, Oct 18 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	TENTATIVE 1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on Systems or Product and Process
Tuesday, Oct 30 and Wednesday, Oct 31 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	TENTATIVE 1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on Systems or Product and Process
Tuesday, Nov 13 and Thursday, Nov 15 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	TENTATIVE 1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on Systems or Product and Process
Tuesday, Nov 27 and Wednesday, Nov 28 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	TENTATIVE 1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on Systems or Product and Process
Tuesday, Dec 11 and Thursday, Dec 13 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	TENTATIVE 1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on Systems or Product and Process

August 8, 2001 Redlined Framework

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

~~NEED REFERENCE TO CUSTOMER/PROVIDER NEGOTIATIONS~~
~~OBJECTIVE – TO GAIN CONSENSUS ON A NATIONAL GUIDELINE PROCESS FOR THE FOLLOWING TOPICS~~

[Note: Qwest has agreed to change the following terms: Customers to CLEC and Provider to Qwest]

INTRODUCTION [need to re-address at a later date]—Action Item #~~18~~17

The Change Management Process (CMP) is a method used by ~~customers~~ Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs) and ~~a local service provider~~Qwest to initiate, communicate, prioritize, schedule, test and implement ~~enhancements~~ changes to ~~provider~~Qwest Operational Support Systems (OSS), ~~interfaces~~ which directly or indirectly impact a CLEC~~.~~

The change management process creates a framework for meetings in which changes to the ~~provider~~Qwest's OSSs and their business rules may be introduced or discussed. The ~~customer's~~ CLEC's Point Of Contact (POC) may request ~~interface~~ changes for future consideration by submitting a Change Request Form to ~~the provider's~~Qwest's POC.

SCOPE [need to re-address at a later date]—Action Item #~~18~~17

- **OSS (Pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance/repair, billing)**
- **LSOG**
- **VSOG (ISSUE 2037)**
- ASOG

This document defines the processes for change management of manual processes and electronic ~~interfaces~~ systems relative to pre-order, ~~and pre-~~order, **provisioning, maintenance/repair, and billing** functions. ~~Interface impact is defined as changes to field content or format, or changes in the business rules used to govern field population.~~ This includes[1] national guideline changes, e.g., LSOG, as well as ~~provider~~ Qwest specific ~~interface~~ process and system changes. Changes include new functionality, enhancements to existing functionality, introduction/retirement of ~~interfaces~~ processes and systems and maintenance activities affecting production defects. System impacts include changes to field content or format, or changes in the business rules used to govern field population, etc. ~~Desired changes should be submitted to the appropriate ATIS Forum.~~

The scope~~is~~ includes any ~~pre-order, order~~ business rules, ~~interface~~ system testing and maintenance that impact ongoing and future

[1] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

technical and operational processes, and changes that alter the relationship in the manner in which ~~the provider~~Qwest and ~~customer~~ a CLEC do business.

ADMINISTRATION

MANAGING THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Change Management POC

~~The provider~~Qwest and each ~~customer~~ CLEC will designate primary and secondary change management POC(s) who will serve as the official designees for matters regarding this CMP. The primary POC is the official voting member, and a secondary (alternate) POC can vote in the absence of the primary POC. There can be more than one secondary POC for each ~~customer~~CLEC.

~~Customers~~ CLECs and ~~provider~~ Qwest will exchange POC information including items such as:

- Name
- Title
- Company
- Telephone number
- E-mail address
- Fax number
- Cell phone/p~~P~~ager number

Change Management POC List

Primary and secondary ~~customer~~CLEC POCs should be included in ~~the provider~~Qwest maintained distribution list. It is the ~~customer's~~ CLEC's responsibility to notify ~~the provider~~Qwest of any POC changes. The list will be made available to all participating ~~customers~~CLECs with permission of the POCs.

Preferred Method of Communication

The preferred method of communication is e-mail with supporting information posted to the web site. ~~(deferred to action item)~~

MEETINGS

Change Management meetings will be conducted on a regularly scheduled basis, at least on a monthly basis. Meeting participants can choose to attend meetings in person or participate by conference call~~, when available~~.

~~The CMP team consists of representatives from the customers (or their authorized agents) and the provider. This team~~Meetings are held ~~meets~~ to review, prioritize, manage the implementation of ~~scheduled~~ process and system changes ~~releases~~ and ~~make recommendations for~~address change management requests.
~~The provider~~Qwest will review the status of all applicable change requests. The meeting may also include discussions of ~~the provider's~~Qwest's development view.

CLEC's request for additional agenda items and associated materials should be submitted to the ~~provider~~Qwest at least five (5) business days by noon (MST) in advance of the meeting. ~~The provider~~Qwest is responsible for distributing the agenda and associated meeting materials at least ~~seven~~ three (~~7~~3) business ~~calendar~~ days by noon (MST) in advance of the meeting. ~~The provider~~Qwest will be responsible for preparing, maintaining, and distributing meeting minutes ~~notes~~. Attendees with any walk-on items should bring materials of the walk-on items to the meeting.

All attendees, whether in person or by phone, must identify themselves and the company they represent.

~~Emergency or special~~Additional meetings may be held at the request of ~~the provider~~Qwest or any qualified ~~customer~~ CLEC (as defined in this document). ~~Emergency~~ M~~m~~eeting notification must contain an agenda plus any supporting meeting materials. These meetings should be announced at least ~~two~~ five (~~2~~5) business days prior to their occurrence. Exceptions may be made for emergency situations.

Meeting Materials (Distribution Package) for Change Management Meeting

Meeting materials should include ~~but are not limited to,~~ the following information:

- Meeting Logistics
- Minutes from previous meeting
- Agenda
- Change Requests and responses

- New/Active
- Updated
- Log
- Issues, Action Ite~~e~~ms Log and associated statuses
- Release ~~Notice~~Summary~~,~~ 12 Month Development View
- Monthly System Outage Report
- Any other material to be discussed

Qwest will provide Meeting Materials (Distribution Package) electronically by noon 3 business days prior to the Monthly CMP Meeting. In addition, Qwest will provide hard copies of the Distribution Package at the Monthly CMP Meeting. ~~The provider may distribute printed copies of the previously provided meeting materials at the change management meeting. The provider will review the status of all applicable change requests. The meeting may also include discussions of the provider's development view.~~

Meeting ~~Notes~~ Minutes for Change Management Meeting

~~The provider~~Qwest will take ~~notes~~minutes. ~~Meeting notes should include, but are not limited to, the following:~~

~~Current status of change requests and release notices~~
~~Issues, Action items and statuses~~

- ~~Attendees, Company represented~~

~~The provider~~Qwest will summarize discussions in meeting minutes and include any revised documents such as Issues, Action items and statuses.

~~Notes~~ Minutes should be distributed to meeting participants for comments or revisions no later than ~~seven~~ five (~~7~~5) ~~calendar~~ business days by noon (MST)after the meeting. ~~Customer~~CLEC comments should be provided within two (2) business days by noon (MST). ~~Updated notes~~Revised minutes, if ~~customer~~CLEC comments are received ~~provided~~, should be distributed within nine ~~eleven~~ (~~11~~9) ~~calendar~~ business days by noon (MST) after the meeting.

~~Provider~~ Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site [Need to re-visit—ACTION ITEM #17G)

To facilitate access to CMP documentation, ~~the provider~~Qwest will maintain CMP information on its web site. The web site should be easy to use and updated in a timely manner. The Web site should be a well organized central repository for CLEC notifications and CMP documentation. Active documentation including meeting materials

(Distribution Package), should be maintained on the website. Change Requests and release notifications should be identified in accordance with the agreed upon naming convention, to facilitate ease of identification. [action item #] Qwest will maintain closed and old versions of documents on the web site's Archive page for 18 months before storing off line. Information that has been removed from the web site can be obtained by contacting the appropriate Qwest CMP Manager. At a minimum, the web site will ~~should~~ ~~contain~~ include:

- Current version of ~~the provider~~Qwest CMP document describing CMP's purpose and scope of setting forth the CMP objectives, procedures, and timelines, including release life cycles.
- Calendar of release dates
- OSS hours of availability
- Links to related web sites, such as IMA EDI, IMA GUI, CEMR, and Notices
- Current CMP escalation process
- CMP prioritization process description and guidelines
- Change Request form and instructions to complete form
- Submitted and open Change Requests and the status of each
- Responses to Change Requests and written responses to CLEC inquiries
- Meeting (formal and informal) information for CMP monthly meetings and interim meetings or conference calls, including descriptions of meetings and participants, agendas, sign-up forms, and schedules
- ~~Test case scenarios~~
- A log of ~~customer~~CLEC and ~~provider~~Qwest change requests and associated statuses
- ~~Issues, Action items logs and associated statuses~~Meeting materials (distribution package)
- Meeting ~~notes~~minutes
- Release announcements and other CLEC notifications and associated requirements
- Directory to CLEC notifications for the month
- Business rules, SATE test case scenarios ~~based on national guidelines and~~ technical specifications, and user guides will be provided via links on the CMP web site.~~provider's specific requirements~~

- Contact information for the CMP POC list, including CLEC, Qwest and other participants (with participant consent to publish contact information on web page).

~~(Action Item List item)~~

August 8, 2001 Redlined Framework

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

- ESCALATION PROCESS

- RELEASE SCHEDULE
- PRIORITIZATION

MANAGED CHANGES

CHANGE TO EXISTING INTERFACES

~~Customer~~CLEC Originated Change

Changes may include new functionality and/or enhancements to existing interface functionality.

~~Provider~~ Qwest Originated Change

~~Customer~~CLEC impacting changes may include new functionality and/or enhancements to existing interface functionality.

Industry Guideline Change

Changes associated with telecommunications industry guidelines using a national implementation timeline. These may include new functionality and/or enhancements to existing interface functionality. Either ~~the provider~~Qwest or the ~~customer~~CLEC may initiate the change request. These guidelines are industry defined by the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS).

Regulatory Change

Changes mandated by regulatory or legal entities, such as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), a state commission/authority, or state and federal courts. Regulatory changes are not voluntary but are requisites to comply with newly passed legislation, court rulings or regulatory requirements. These may include new functionality and/or enhancements to existing interface functionality. Either the ~~customer~~CLEC or ~~the provider~~Qwest may initiate the change request.

Tracking Change Requests

~~The provider~~Qwest will assign a tracking number to each change request and track changes to each change request. Tracking will be accomplished via a change request log.

- **INTRODUCTION OF A NEW INTERFACE**
- **RETIREMENT OF EXISTING INTERFACES**

IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGE

CHANGE REQUEST INITIATION PROCESS

REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

Draft Interface Release Requirements

Prior to implementing a new interface or a change to an existing interface, ~~the provider~~Qwest will notify ~~customer~~CLECs of the draft release requirements.

Notifications for regulatory changes are based on applicable law and / or regulatory rules. If no time frame for implementation of the mandated change is specified, it shall be subject to the CMP timeline as described below. ~~Customer~~CLECs and ~~provider~~ Qwest will, where possible, make every effort to encourage regulators to follow the CMP timeline for mandated changes.

Time lines for industry guidelines related changes are based on ~~customer~~CLEC / ~~provider~~ Qwest agreement in conjunction with the rollout of national guidelines, subject to any overriding regulatory obligations. (See 2233a3.doc for graphic depiction of the following time lines)

Notification for ~~customer~~CLEC impacting releases, which may include ~~customer~~CLEC initiated requests, ~~provider~~Qwest initiated requests and regulatory changes, will typically occur at least 73 calendar days prior to implementing the release. This notification may include draft business rules. ~~Customer~~CLECs have fifteen (15) calendar days from the initial publication of draft documentation to provide comments / questions on the documentation.

Technical specifications will be produced and distributed to ~~customer~~CLECs 66 calendar days prior to implementation.

Final business rules and technical specifications for the release will be published at least 45 calendar days prior to implementation.

For ~~customer~~CLEC impacting releases, more or less notification may be provided based on severity and the impact of the changes in the release. For example, ~~the provider~~Qwest can implement the change in less than 45 calendar days with ~~customer~~CLEC concurrence.

Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements

The notification will contain:

- Written summary of change(s)
- Target time frame for implementation
- Draft business rules or access instructions

Walk Through of Draft Interface Release Requirements

If requested by one or more ~~customer~~CLECs within fourteen (14) calendar days of receiving the initial release requirements, ~~the provider~~Qwest will sponsor a walk through with the appropriate internal subject matter experts. ~~The provider~~Qwest will hold this walk through no later than fifty-two (52) calendar days prior to the scheduled implementation.

~~Customer~~CLEC's Comments on Draft Interface Release Requirements

Any ~~customer~~CLEC comments or requests for clarification must be submitted in writing to ~~the provider~~Qwest.

~~Provider~~Qwest Response to Comments

~~The provider~~Qwest will review and respond with written answers to all ~~customer~~CLEC issues, comments and/or concerns within seven (7) calendar days. The answers will be shared with all ~~customer~~CLECs, unless the ~~customer~~CLEC's question(s) is marked proprietary. Any changes that may occur as a result of the responses will be distributed to all ~~customer~~CLECs in the same notification.

Content of Final Business Rules and Technical Specifications Release Requirements

~~Customer~~CLEC responses to the draft business rules and technical specifications may be incorporated into the final release requirements.

The final release documentation should include the following:

- Summary of changes
- Final complete documents
- Release date

- **TRAINING**

TESTING

- INTERFACE TESTING

PRODUCTION SUPPORT

POST IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT

Either ~~the provider~~Qwest may detect or the ~~customer~~CLEC may report a situation involving production interfaces. These problems typically affect the ability to exchange and process transactions between the ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest. Problems are evaluated according to ~~customer~~CLEC impact in the following manner:

Production Stopped:

Interface Unusable – An interface problem that results in a totally unusable interface requiring emergency action. Transactions cannot be exchanged or processed between ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest and manual work-arounds are not feasible. The correction of the problem is considered essential to continued operation. The ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest should dedicate resources to expedite the resolution.

~~Provider~~Qwest Detected
- Initial communication = 1 hour
- Status = Every 2 hours until problem corrected

~~Customer~~CLEC Reported
- Notify provider
- Initial communication = 1 hour
- Status = Every 2 hours until problem corrected

Production Degraded:

Interface Affecting - An interface problem that requires a work-around(s) on the part of the ~~customer~~CLEC or ~~the provider~~Qwest. The correction of the problem is considered critical to continued operation. It does not stop production, but affects key applications.

~~Provider~~Qwest Detected
- Initial communication = 4 hours
- Status = As appropriate, at least weekly until a correction date is established.

~~Customer~~CLEC Reported
- Notify ~~provider~~Qwest
- Initial communication = 4 hours
- Status = As appropriate, at least weekly until a correction date is established.

APPENDIX

- DEFINITION OF TERMS
- GLOSSARY OF TERMS
- CHANGE REQUEST FORM AND CHECKLIST
- CHANGE REQUST PRIORITIZATION FORM
- CMP PRIORITIZATION PROCESS EXAMPLE

1232943/67817.150

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
Tuesday, August 14 and Thursday, August 16, 2001 Working Sessions

1005 17th Street, 1st Floor, Jr. Board Room, Denver, CO
Bridgeline: 1-877-847-0304, pass code 7101617#

NOTE: These FINAL meeting minutes were circulated to the CMP Re-design Core Team Members in attendance for their review and comments are noted in italic throughout the minutes.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team (Team) and other participants met August 14th and 16th to continue the effort to improve Qwest's Change Management Process. Following is the write-up of the discussions, action items, and decisions made in the working sessions. The attachments to these meeting minutes are as follow-

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Attendance Record
- Attachment 2: Agenda, August 14th and 16th
- Attachment 2a: Updated Agenda, August 16th
- Attachment 3: Core Team Issues and Action Items Log (updated)
- Attachment 4: Qwest's Naming Convention Spreadsheet (revised-Proposal)
- Attachment 5: Notification Process Plan (Proposal)
- Attachment 6 Sample Report (Proposal)
- Attachment 7: Voting Tally Form (Included in 7a)
- Attachment 7a: Procedures for Voting and the Impasse Resolution Process (Draft Proposal)
- Attachment 8: Core Team Members Expectations/Responsibilities (revised)
- Attachment 9: AT&T August 13, 2001 Memorandum
- Attachment 10: Qwest Severity Levels (Informational)
- Attachment 11: Schedule—CMP Re-design Working Sessions (revised)

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting on August 14 began with introductions of the meeting attendees—see Attachment 1 for the Attendance Record. Judy Lee advised attendees of the protocol to state name and company when making a statement. Lee reviewed the two-day agenda (refer to Attachment 2: August 14 and 16 Agenda) and asked for suggestions of changes or modifications. No suggestions were offered. Lee acknowledged the receipt of AT&T's memorandum expressing concern in five areas. Lee asked AT&T and other participants if this discussion can be added to the agenda under "Feedback on August 7-8 Meeting Minutes and Discussion Elements." AT&T and participants agreed. Copies of the meeting materials including AT&T's memorandum and agenda were made available for all attendees. Meeting materials were issued via e-mail to the Core Team and attendees on the conference bridge.

Lee facilitated the discussion on the following Issues and Action Items: (refer to Attachment 3 Issues and Action Items Log)

- Naming Convention
- Notification Process Plan
- Sample Report
- Voting Tally Form

NAMING CONVENTION (see Attachment 4)
Judy Schultz-Qwest reviewed the excel spreadsheet "Proposed Naming Convention for Web Site & Formal Notice Subject Line" included in the material handouts. Schultz's review emphasized the Categories (Product, Process, Systems, Network, Web and CMP), subcategories and notification subject line. Larry Gindlesberger-Covad requested that "Agenda Meeting & Materials" be added as a subcategory under the CMP Category. Schultz-Qwest agreed to include this subcategory in the revised spreadsheet.

Product Category
Sharon Van Meter-AT&T asked if the naming convention on the excel spreadsheet was just an example. Schultz-Qwest explained that this was the proposed list used to modify the web site and formal notice subject line. Terry Bahner-AT&T asked if LNP (Local Number Portability) would fall under Resale Products & Services. (Bahner's question is answered below.) Van Meter-AT&T also asked whether Directory Listings would be under Product – Resale. Schultz-Qwest explained that the Subject Line would contain a descriptor to allow readability of notices. Gindlesberger-Covad clarified that a reader will need to select Product, Resale then Directory Listing. Terry Wicks-Allegiance indicated that it was logical to access category Resale, then open all subjects associated with the subcategory Product & Services. Schultz-Qwest clarified that the following sequence would occur: Product – Resale Product & Services (view all notices under the subcategory), then select RN, CR, etc. Van Meter-AT&T asked if she would be able to pull up the subject matter on a specific category-subcategory. Gindlesberger-Covad indicated that this is just a web site posting not what is sent to a user.

Lee recapped that the viewing sequence for the Product Category will be Subcategory 1 (e.g., Resale, UNE) – Subcategory 2 (e.g., Directory Listing, LNP) – Subcategory 3 (e.g., RN, CR, Training) – Effective Date – Serial Number – Suffix.

Wicks-Allegiance requested that descriptor be added to Subcategory 1. Schultz-Qwest agreed to revise the naming convention spreadsheet.

Bahner-AT&T repeated that she is still unclear about where LNP would fall. Wicks-Allegiance indicated that this document falls under notifications. Lee provided the example of Product – Resale – LNP – Effective Date – Serial Number – Suffix.

Schultz-Qwest questioned whether or not there was a consensus supporting a standard naming convention for the web site and notifications. Van Meter-AT&T indicated that the proposal addresses the web site naming convention, but questioned how the naming convention will impact those notices sent via e-mail (mail-outs). Schultz-Qwest advised the naming convention applies to mail-outs, but there might be a limitation of characters for the subject line. She also stated that 'buy-in' for the proposed naming convention for web site and notification from the CLEC community at the next Monthly CMP Meeting is necessary.

Sandy Evans-Sprint questioned what does Suffix mean. Lee asked if Sprint would hold this discussion item until the team closed on the subcategory requirements. Evans-Sprint agreed to bring this item up later.

Process Category
The Team agreed that the proposed subcategories for Process were acceptable. However, Evans-Sprint felt that Provisioning needs to be added to the Process subcategory. Gindlesberger-Covad agreed. Van Meter-AT&T indicated that Provisioning has a different meaning for different people. Gindlesberger-Covad advised that it depends on where you come from: Network, Ordering or Billing. Wicks-Allegiance suggested that under the category of Process, "Ordering" should be revised to "Ordering/Provisioning" and "Repair" to "Maintenance/Repair." Qwest and CLEC participants supported this approach.

Lee questioned what the Subject Line would look like for the proposed change. Wicks stated that the subject line would read as: Process – Order/Provisioning – CR – Effective Date – Serial Number – Suffix. Schultz-Qwest questioned whether Subcategory 2 on Process (as with Product) would apply and the Team agreed that it would not. Wicks-Allegiance clarified that there is no Subcategory 2 for Process (as with Product). Gindlesberger-Covad agreed that a Process category doesn't need to have the same Subcategories as Product.

System Category

Wicks-Allegiance requested that Raw Loop Data Tool, a GUI, be added to subcategory 1. Schultz-Qwest agreed to add this GUI to the revised spreadsheet. Jarby Blackmun-Qwest advised that once the CMP re-design team provides its naming convention elements, she will work with the development team and provide a visual representation of the web site. Schultz-Qwest suggested that a descriptor is required for subcategory 3 under Systems. The Team agreed that a description be added to the subcategory for RN, CR and Training.

Wicks-Allegiance questioned how the RN/CR would be displayed. The Team felt that a method for sorting Subcategory 3 items was needed. Blackmun-Qwest asked the Team to determine the sorting requirements—how do the CLECs want to access notices. Gindlesberger- Covad shared with the team that there is an easy way to accomplish a sort on most items except to sort alphabetically by descriptor. Wicks-Allegiance indicated that the data was a static posting and a user would need to scroll. Schultz-Qwest suggested that the Team needs to determine the easiest way to scan data. Blackmun-Qwest advised that the best way to scan would be to devise an addressable name of the document (i.e., date – precede the name with the date). Schultz-Qwest asked the Team for consensus. Wicks-Allegiance indicated that dates meant nothing. Blackmun-Qwest indicated that we could have description – date – serial number as the subject line.

Lynne Powers-Eschelon expressed a concern that Subcategory 1 for Systems was not broad enough. The Team agreed to add, "Other" to the Subcategory listing. Gindlesberger-Covad asked that the subcategory include the systems for tracking trouble tickets and processing orders to the Central Office (i.e., WFA). Powers-Eschelon asked that the TIRKS system be included in the subcategory. Schultz-Qwest will assess what systems should be included in the naming convention subcategory.

Schultz-Qwest requested clarification for Outage Notifications. Wendy Green-Qwest indicated that notices address the interface. Powers-Eschelon felt that backend systems impacting the CLECs need to be included. She was willing to table this issue until a later discussion. Karen Clauson-Eschelon emphasized that tabling the issue did not alleviate the need for a discussion of necessary notification on changes to backend systems.

Mark Routh-Qwest asked Jarby Blackmun if it is difficult to add other systems to the Systems subcategory at a later date. Blackmun-Qwest said it would not be difficult. Wicks-Allegiance stated that it would be permissible to break out the "Other" category in the future. Gindlesberger-Covad stated that since the Team identified two more systems, therefore Qwest should add WFA and TIRKS to the Systems subcategory. Schultz-Qwest advised that she would have to take the request back to the Qwest System's department. Gindlesberger-Covad identified Bob Kayler as the Qwest IT contact for WFA and TIRKS. Powers-Eschelon asked what the internal notification process is for WFA and TIRKS. Clauson-Eschelon indicated that this would allow a formal process for the backend systems. It was agreed to table the discussion until Jeff Thompson-Qwest arrived.

Network Category

Gindlesberger-Covad advised that there are different procedures for networks (e.g., virtual co-location splitter replacement). The Team agreed that Procedures should be added as a Subcategory 3. Powers-Eschelon asked if there was a repository for procedures. Lee advised that Technical Publications could be found under Network. Gindlesberger-Covad indicated that there was a procedure for the replacement of a splitter card. There would be a procedure for

what the technician replaces and what the RMA process would be. He felt that this would be under Process – Maintenance/Repair or Training. Lee advised that procedures support a process and perhaps the Team should add procedures under Process. The Team agreed to add Joint Procedures in Subcategory 2 (RN/CR/Training) for Process.

Lee redirected the meeting back to the Network Category. Powers-Eschelon asked how outage notifications are handled. Schultz-Qwest took an action item to have a Network representative join the next re-design meeting to discuss the Network outage notification procedures. Powers-Eschelon asked that Qwest advise what the notification process is for planned and after-the-fact outages.

Web
Lee asked what types of notifications would be included in this category. Blackmun-Qwest advised that the notifications included in Web would typically consist of notices on changes to the home page (www.qwest.com) and architectural changes. The Team provided no additional suggestions for this category.

CMP
Lee reminded the Team that it was previously agreed to add "Meeting Agenda and Material" under the CMP category. In addition, Evans-Sprint requested that Point-of-Contact information (primary and alternate) be added to the subcategory-Distribution List. Routh-Qwest mentioned that Qwest will keep the existing Agenda on the web site. Schultz-Qwest advised that Qwest is not proposing to eliminate anything, but to modify the web site for improved readability. Bahner-AT&T requested that the Call Center Number be added to the Subcategory for Outages. Powers-Eschelon requested that "Improvement Process" be added to the CMP category.

Tariffs
Evans-Sprint requested that "Tariffs" as a Category be added.

Action Items:

- #30: CICMP Web Site Category CMP—add subcategory "Meeting Agenda and Material"
- #31: CICMP Web Site Category—Change "Ordering" to "Ordering/Provisioning" and "Repair" to "Maintenance/Repair"
- #32: CICMP Web Site Category Systems—add Raw Loop Data Tool to subcategory IMA GUI
- #33: CICMP Web Site Category—add a "Other" category
- #34: CICMP Web Site Category Systems—investigate adding backend systems (e.g., WFA, TIRKS)
- #35: CICMP Web Site Category Process—add "Procedures" as a subcategory
- #36: CICMP Web Site Category—add a "Tariff" category
- #40: Notifications—determine if Call Center outages should be included in the "Outages" subcategory
- #41: CICMP Web Site—add subcategory "Re-design" in the CMP category
- #42: Notification—determine how outages are communicated to CLECs

NOTIFICATION PROCESS PLAN (refer to Attachment 5)
Blackmun-Qwest reviewed the Notification Process Plan included in the material handout. She indicated that this would change based on the final agreements made on the Naming Convention. She indicated that the challenge is how to address the proposed subcategories. Matt Rossi-Qwest informed the Team that "Training & Notices" will include Release Notices (RNs). Blackmun-Qwest advised that Qwest will modify the web site based on the needs. She sees RNs as notifications. Schultz-Qwest proposed that the revised spreadsheet will serve as the initial requirements for the web site.

Kathy Stichter-Eschelon expressed concern that the proposal will break out Change Requests (CRs) into different locations. Powers-Eschelon expressed that the CLECs must have the

capability to view multiple CRs at a time. Clauson-Eschelon clarified that the naming convention serves as a navigational tool. The proposed category-subcategory is another way to access the information as well as being able to access all CRs and RNs in one place. Blackmun-Qwest mentioned that her goal is to develop a web site that will archive all notifications to CLECs. Clauson-Eschelon advised that the CLECs need to access a database of information and will have the ability to access information by the format of the spreadsheet (i.e., Category-subcategory). Lee summarized that the CLECs want to access all CRs and RNs at once, in addition, the ability to access notices by Category-Subcategory. Blackmun and Schultz-Qwest will ensure CLEC needs are included in the naming convention proposal and provide feedback to the Team at the September 5 working session. Clauson-Eschelon requested Qwest to bring screen shots of the web site to the September 5 session.

Powers-Eschelon stated that the Team has been discussing web site structure. She is not sure about the process on the mail-out. Qwest's notices refer CLECs to their respective Account Manager, but Eschelon is referring questions to the Service Managers. Eschelon asked whom to contact on specifics pertaining to the notice—prefer to speak with 'owner' of the notice. Schultz-Qwest mentioned that she will investigate and report back to the Team at the September 5 session. Gindlesberger-Covad shared that SBC also advises CLECs to contact only the Account Manager with questions pertaining to the notice. Powers-Eschelon indicated that this is an inconceivable amount of information for one person to handle. LeiLani Hines-WorldCom mentioned that Worldcom is quite confused as to who is the point-of-contact to address issues because she works with both the sales and service managers. Wicks-Allegiance suggested that Qwest include in its notices the subject matter expert as the point-of-contact. Hines-WorldCom stated that some notices have conflicting information on who to contact with questions. Powers-Eschelon stated that there are duplicate notices.

Lee summarized that CLECs want two ways of accessing notices: ability to access all notices (e.g., CRs, RNs, Training) as well as the ability to access by subcategories under a specific category.

Serial Number and Suffix

Schultz-Qwest asked Blackmun-Qwest if there is a need for a unique serial number. Blackmun-Qwest said that the serial number is used for internal identification. Lee indicated that Evans-Sprint sample letter from Qwest's mail-out has a serial number at the top portion of the notice, not the subject line. Van Meter-AT&T suggested that the subject line show an effective date, issue date and keep Qwest's internal naming convention. Gindlesberger-Covad asked for clarification if the serial number contains the issue date of the notice. He suggested that the effective date and serial number (Blackmun's current numbering scheme) be included in the subject line. Blackmun-Qwest suggested that the document number replace the serial number. Bahner-AT&T suggested that the document number does not get moved into the subject. Lee reviewed the current mail-out notification letter. Bahner-AT&T suggested that the letter be revised to come up with a Subject Line. Blackmun-Qwest advised that the naming convention of the letter should be where to find it on the web site. The Team agreed on the following naming convention.

Example:

Prod.Lis/Interconnect.RN.[Descriptor].08140100032.I (Initial)
R (Revision)

Wicks-Allegiance questioned if CRs should follow the same naming convention. Rossi-Qwest stated that CRs should be outside of the naming convention. Schultz-Qwest expressed concern that there will be two separate naming conventions. Hines-WorldCom mentioned that perhaps subcategory 2 (CRs, RNs, Training) should precede subcategory 1. Wicks-Allegiance stated that the example above would work if CRs were not included in this naming convention. He suggested that CRs should remain as it currently is, but add a descriptor to the subject line. Lee recapped that the CR subject line for Product, Process and Systems will have a CR Number and a description.

The Team agreed on the suffix format. It was agreed that every notification goes out I (initial) and subsequent revisions would be R1 (first revision) through Rn.

Action Items:

- #37: CICMP Web Site—provide multiple methods of accessing information on the web site
- #38: Notifications—identify designated owner or point-of-contact for mail outs
- #39: CICMP Web Site—provide screen shots of the web site
- #43: CICMP Web Site—investigate possibilities for sorting and displaying subcategory 3 information
- #44: Notification—Create instructions to access web site notification

SAMPLE REPORT (refer to Attachment 6)

Schultz-Qwest shared the Sample Report with the Team. She stated that based on CLECs request to have everything in one place, the report accomplishes that need. Powers-Eschelon expressed a need to keep historical status (i.e., who said what). Gindlesberger-Covad asked that a contact number for the director and owner be added. Evans-Sprint asked where will a CLEC find all pertinent information pertaining to a particular CR. Schultz-Qwest shared with the Team that all pertinent information for the CR will be contained in the Access database. She clarified that CLECs will have access to the report on the web site, but direct access to the Access database will not be available. Bahner-AT&T expressed concern regarding posting confidential information (e.g., end user name and telephone number) on the web site. Gindlesberger-Covad also expressed concern about proprietary CRs. Schultz-Qwest acknowledged this concern and indicated that CLEC provided samples of problems (e.g., PONs) will reside with the CMP Manager who will manage the report. Schultz-Qwest committed to work with the developer and establish an implementation timeframe for the report. Wicks-Allegiance asked if this report will replace the CR and RN Logs. He thought we would have a link to the report on the web site. Lee asked the Team if the report should reflect the same naming convention for the "Area Impacted" field in the report. The Team concurred that the Area Impacted should reflect the naming convention for Process. The Core Team agreed to use the Report.

Action Item:

- #50: Types of Changes—provide flowchart and procedures for CR handling

VOTING TALLY FORM (refer to Attachment 7a)

Lee reviewed the proposed form with the Team. Bahner-AT&T asked if the form allows for a Letter of Authorization (LOA). Lee will update the form to include the LOA. Powers-Eschelon expressed that she was not sure how the Qwest vote would be identified. Routh-Qwest advised that Qwest's vote is a position. Gindlesberger-Covad thought it was understood that it was Qwest's position. Powers-Eschelon indicated that Qwest's position should be included on the form. Lee will include a place for Qwest's position on the revised form. Clauson-Eschelon mentioned why a vote is necessary when CLECs and Qwest are in a collaborative process. She further asked, if there isn't a majority position from the CLECs, what do we do. Wicks-Allegiance reiterated that with a dead-lock, it comes down to a CLEC giving in. Van Meter-AT&T advised that the CLECs need to work out a way to bring consensus of a position. Gindlesberger-Covad indicated that the CLECs need to come back with a position on this. Wicks-Allegiance suggested that when the CLECs are still dead-locked the vote gets deferred to the next meeting. Powers-Eschelon clarified that this discussion regarding the voting process is for the re-design effort only.

Wicks-Allegiance stated that he would like to see the CLECs reach a collaborative decision. Clauson-Eschelon mentioned that the CLECs should try, but if they can't reach consensus, the discussion needs to get deferred. Van Meter-AT&T agreed with this approach. Gindlesberger-Covad stated that by delaying, it gives an opportunity to lobby, or get a LOA by the next meeting. He agreed that the ultimate goal is to reach a collaborative position the first time. Van Meter-AT&T asked that a separate addendum document for instructions to vote is needed. Lee will

develop guidelines on the voting process. Van Meter-AT&T advised that there must be a way to resolve an impasse among the CLECs. Bahner-AT&T wanted to discuss on how to break a CLEC impasse with CLEC community offline. She took an action item to provide feedback to the Team at the September 5 working session. Gindlesberger-Covad assumed that before a CLEC and Qwest impasse, Qwest would have already taken the issue to upper management. He further stated that the Team needs to get the next step in the process. Wicks-Allegiance indicated that after the collaborative effort and an impasse situation exists, the issue should go to a dispute resolution (e.g., a state commission or 3rd party if both parties agree). Lee recapped the Team's positions if an impasse still exists after the escalation process is utilized. Lee took an action item to revise the Voting Tally Form and to develop procedures for a vote and the impasse resolution process as it pertains to the re-design working sessions. Note: A draft proposal for the voting procedures and impasse resolution process is set forth in Attachment 7a. This proposal is based on the discussion in the August 16 session and is subject to further discussion and revision.

Action Items:

- #45: Voting Tally Form—provide a box for Qwest's position on the form
- #46: Voting—develop a proposal on voting
- #48: Voting—determine how to resolve an impasse issue

REVIEW OTHER ISSUES AND ACTION ITEMS (see Attachment 3)

Lee advised that pages 1-4 are open items and reviewed the following items with the Team:

- Item 1H: Closed—Marcia Lees, SBC Telecom, provided concurrence to post its voting results of July 19
- Item 9: Propose to rename CICMP to CMP at 8/15 CMP meeting
- Item 11B: Closed—Sample Report
- Item 11C: Meeting distribution package (see discussion below)

Qwest to revise the Final July 19, 2001 Meeting Minutes to include the voting results on the 3rd Party Provider issue (related to Item #1H). Powers-Eschelon stated that the reviewed sample report contains the information that is currently spread among multiple documents (meeting distribution package). Wicks-Allegiance mentioned that the multiple documents can be eliminated if the revised log (sample report) includes all pertinent and necessary information. Powers-Eschelon emphasized that Qwest must alleviate 'surprise presentations.' Meeting materials need to be distributed and posted in advance of the monthly meetings. Wicks-Allegiance suggested that after the Wednesday, August 15 meeting, Qwest should be able to come up with a sample meeting package. Schultz-Qwest took an action item to provide the re-design Team with a sample package for review. Other issues and actions items were discussed and the disposition for each item is summarized below.

- 13B: Closed—The Core Team agreed to close and create new action item (39) to provide screen pages
- 13C: The Core Team agreed to extend to September 18th
- 13E: Lee advised that Qwest has begun to date stamp the web site pages when the page changes. The Team agreed to close.
- 13F: Extended to Sep 18, but an update (and timeline for rollout) will be provided at the September 5th meeting.
- 14F: Closed—provide naming convention proposal for subcategories.
- 16: Closed—posted on CICMP Re-design web site and included as meeting handouts.
- 28: Propose at the 8/15 monthly CMP meeting to move the 12/19 meeting to 12/12
- 29: Closed—Evans-Sprint provided other ILEC frameworks on the exception process.

Action Item:

- #11C: CMP Meeting Distribution Package—provide a sample distribution package for the Team to review
- #57: Meeting Minutes Update—revise July 19 Final Meeting Minutes to include the voting results on the 3rd Party Provider issue.

FINAL MEETING MINUTES, AUGUST 7 AND 8 (refer to CICMP Re-design Web Site)
As a standing agenda item, all participants may provide feedback to the previous working session final meeting minutes. Lee asked if there are any comments to the Final August 7 and 8 Meeting Minutes. Lee also acknowledged and deferred discussion on AT&T's August 13, 2001 memorandum until later in the meeting—see below for discussion. Wicks-Allegiance asked that on page 3, paragraph 4 change "CLEC" to "Co-Provider" for CICMP. He also requested to correct his last name to 'Wicks.' Powers-Eschelon stated that the minutes were good, but would like to see the action items stated in the meeting minutes. Evans-Sprint clarified that responses to CRs are sent to the originator via email, not posted on the web site. She requested a correction on page 6, paragraph 1. Lee will work with Jim Maher-Qwest to make corrections and distribute/post the revised Final August 7 and 8 Meeting Minutes.

Action Item:

- #54: Meeting Minutes—add action item verbiage to the meeting minutes
- #56: Meeting Minutes Update—revise August 7 and 8 Final Meeting Minutes with changes mentioned above

EXPECTATIONS/RESPONSIBILITIES (see Attachment 8)
Lee presented and asked if there were any upgrades to the Core Team Expectations/ Responsibilities. Stichter-Eschelon requested and the Team accepted the following change to clarify the last bullet.

Old: Core Team member will not be allowed to vote on any issue in which they did not participate.

To: New Core Team member will not be allowed to reopen a vote on any issue that has been decided on.

Lee will update the matrix to reflect the clarification change.

Action Item:

- #58: Core Team Expectations—update the document as stated above

AT&T AUGUST 13, 2001 MEMORANDUM—COMMENTS CONCERNING THE AUGUST 7 AND 8 MEETINGS (refer to Attachment 9 or email message from Donna Osborne-Miller/AT&T)
Donna Osborne-Miller on August 13, 2001 distributed via e-mail to the CMP Re-design Team AT&T's Comments Concerning the August 7th and August 8th Meetings. A printed copy of this memorandum was also available as a handout at the August 14 working session. The memorandum identified five areas of concern. And they are:

- Voting
- Scope
- KPMG
- Category 3 Exception Changes
- Unilaterally demand that CLECs adopt Qwest's RNs

Item 1 – Voting: Lee asked AT&T if the previous discussion on Voting and the Impasse Resolution Process provided enough information to close this item. Osborne-Miller-AT&T agreed that the previous discuss answered AT&T's concern. AT&T agreed to close this item.

Item 2 – Scope: AT&T expressed concern that the Team has not closed on the Scope. Osborne-Miller-AT&T stated that there is a need for an overall purpose to guide the Team through the discussions. She understood that the Team agreed to re-visit the Scope at a later date, but a roadmap such as a Table of Contents is needed. Schultz-Qwest mentioned that the Team agreed to re-visit the Scope at the September 20 working session, however, at the last meeting she asked for input from the Team at the September 5 meeting. Clauson-Eschelon thought Vince (DeGarlais-Scindo) addressed the scope issue about Systems and what affected CLECs. She thought Qwest committed to bring a proposal on what "directly and indirectly' reflected. Schultz-Qwest clarified that Qwest did not agree to the proposed Scope language and agreed to share Qwest's position on Scope at the September 20 meeting. Routh-Qwest indicated that there will be

two definitions of Scope—one on Systems and another on the whole effort. Osborne-Miller-AT&T *stated that it is hard to follow the purpose of the re-design effort.* She asked Bahner and Van Meter, both AT&T, if they were struggling with a definition. Bahner-AT&T suggested that the Team develop an outline to create a foundation. Lee stated that OBF 2233 was the agreed upon outline. Powers-Eschelon asked what Qwest's position is on scope and are they going to include systems. Clauson-Eschelon indicated that AT&T's statement probably confused the situation and asked if AT&T was looking for a "thesis" type document. *[Eschelon COMMENT: I said something to the effect that the group had lumped together the issues, and we needed to get back to AT&T's initial point about a thesis. I was AGREEING with AT&T, not saying that AT&T was being confusing.]* Van Meter-AT&T mentioned that AT&T needs a map on where the Team is going with this process. Bahner-AT&T wanted a structure more like the original OBF 2233 version 1. Osborne-Miller-AT&T stated that the current redline version is OBF 2233 version 2. Lee confirmed that the Team is currently working through OBF Issue 2233 version a1v2. Evans-Sprint emphasized that the Team needs OBF Issue 2233 version 1 as a structure—there is more detail in version 1 than 2. Routh-Qwest suggested that the Team work through the version 1 Table of Contents as a base. Clauson-Eschelon clarify that Eschelon does not participate in OBF and hoped that Qwest wanted to use version 1 as the base. Lee asked the Team to decide what OBF Issue 2233 version framework to use so the Team can begin discussions on Changes to Existing Interfaces on Thursday. Van Meter-AT&T mentioned that AT&T has made nine copies of Verizon's and SBC's Change Management Process frameworks and have provided a copy to those Team members attending the working session in person. Schultz-Qwest clarified that at the kickoff meeting, as a team, it was agreed to use the OBF framework. Van Meter-AT&T thought the redline was Qwest's proposal. Schultz-Qwest clarified that the two-page document previously reviewed was Qwest's proposal and the team wanted to use the OBF framework. Osborne-Miller-AT&T stated that AT&T wants to use version 1 of the OBF framework. Schultz-Qwest requested a soft copy of version 1. Lee recapped that the Team wanted to use OBF Issue 2233 version 1 (a1v1) as baseline. The Team understood that it will not automatically adopt all terms in version 1, but will use other ILEC frameworks as well to create a modified Change Management Process. Furthermore, the previously agreed upon items from version 2 (a1v2) will be built back into the version 1 document.

Powers-Eschelon still expressed confusion as to what is included in Scope.*[Eschelon COMMENTS: Similarly, also on page 9, Eschelon did not "express confusion" about the scope.]* Schultz-Qwest requested that the CLECs provide input to Qwest at the September 5 meeting. Clauson-Eschelon felt that the CLECs were comfortable with the previous language. They do not know all the systems and thought Qwest would come up with the list. Schultz-Qwest stated that the scope should be based on functionality, not systems. Functionality drives the backend systems. Clauson-Eschelon thought Qwest wanted to isolate some systems. *[Eschelon COMMENTS: The last two sentences of this section could also better reflect my comments. For example, as Eschelon stated its position is that a specific list of systems need not be included. Therefore, we didn't ask Qwest to "come up" with a list. If Qwest wants a list included (which we did not understand to be the case), Qwest would have to produce the list]* .Eschelon also expressed concerns on how retail systems implementation impacts the CLEC when Qwest's Retail makes improvements to its systems. *[Eschelon COMMENTS: This should more accurately state: "Powers-Eschelon inquired when the team would address scope. Schultz-Qwest requested that the CLECs provide input to Qwest at the September 5 meeting. Clauson-Eschelon felt that the CLECs were comfortable with the previous language. They do not know all the systems or Qwest's concerns. Schultz-Qwest stated that the scope should be based on functionality, not systems. Functionality drives the backend systems. Clauson-Eschelon asked whether Qwest was attempting to isolate some systems from inclusion in the process. Eschelon also said that changes to Qwest's retail systems should be included in the process. Otherwise, after Qwest's systems are tested, Qwest could improve its retail systems but not its wholesale systems, without CLEC knowledge. The changes would affect CLECs, however, because Qwest retail would have better access to information than CLECs."*

Lee summarized the Team's decision to use the OBF Issue 2233 version 1 (known as OBF Issue 2233 version a1v1) framework as well as other ILEC frameworks for Thursday's meeting.

Item 3—KPMG Consulting: Osborne-Miller-AT&T wanted clarification on KPMG's role in the re-design effort. Ric Woodhouse-KPMG Consulting stated that its role is of an observer. KPMG Consulting does not represent Qwest, CLECs, or pseudo CLECs. They are third party observers. KPMG Consulting stated that it will continue to perform tests and will not hold up testing. KPMG Consulting wants to take back any comments made previously and will refrain from offering opinions, or participating. Gindlesberger-Covad outwardly objected to KPMG Consulting wanting to refrain from offering its opinions. Covad welcomed KPMG Consulting's help. Woodhouse-KPMG emphasized that as a third party tester it must refrain from contributing to the re-design effort. Osborne-Miller-AT&T stated that KPMG Consulting is being paid to be a neutral observer even though the Team would benefit from its experience. *[AT&T COMMENT: I said that KPMG's role is to be a neutral observer. I did not talk about or use the word "PAID" in my statement.]* AT&T adds that perhaps KPMG Consulting can direct the Team to specific subject matter experts. Powers-Eschelon wanted to know what KPMG Consulting will report. Woodhouse-KPMG stated that they will not provide a qualitative position. It was suggested that AT&T may want the TAG to clarify KPMG Consulting's role in the CMP re-design effort. Evans-Sprint mentioned that Sprint has worked with KPMG Consulting at other ILECs and would appreciate any input from KPMG Consulting. Gindlesberger-Covad stated that the Team should have the ability to decide to use KPMG Consulting's input or not. Covad stated that at the last meeting KPMG Consulting's input was just a suggestion. Woodhouse-KPMG will address this issue with its management to clarify its role. The Team realizes that AT&T has the option to approach the TAG for clarification. There is no further action required within the re-design effort.

Item 4—Exception Process:
AT&T asked for clarification if the Exception Process that Qwest proposed only addresses one category of Product and Process. If so, AT&T wants to address OSS first, then Product and Process later. Schultz-Qwest clarified that Qwest wants to discuss exceptions in general, not limited to Product and Process Category 3. Lee emphasized that at the last working session, Schultz-Qwest did clarify that the Exception Process is for Systems, Product and Process although Qwest's 2-page proposal only addresses Category 3 for Product and Process. In fact, Evans-Sprint volunteered to bring Exception Process samples from the other ILECs. Evans-Sprint emphasized the need for the Team to agree on Types of Change before creating an exception process. Schultz-Qwest clarified Qwest's definition of an exception to mean a deviation to the standard Change Management Process, which is different than a Product/Process Category 3. Bahner-AT&T wants the Team to call this process by another word other than exception. Lee advised that SBC's and Verizon's exception process addresses the timeline associated with implementing a change to systems, product or process. For instance, a CLEC would invoke an Exception Process if it wants Qwest to implement a change ahead of the planned date. Evans-Sprint reiterated that the Team needs to define the types of change before discussing an exception process. The Team agreed that the exception process for systems will be addressed first, then product and process at a later working session.

Item 5—Unilaterally Demand CLEC Adoption of Release Notification: Osborne-Miller-AT&T cautioned the Team that Product and Process cannot be in conflict with the Internconnection Agreement (ICA). Gindlesberger-Covad stated that nothing in the CMP improvements would contradict the ICA. Clauson-Eschelon mentioned that there are RNs announcing a product and process that do conflict with the ICA, which emphasize the importance of Qwest allowing CLECs to be involve upfront before a RN is issued. Powers-Eschelon stated that Qwest's Billing Process is in direct conflict with the Minnesota Ruling. There are profile changes that do not agree with Eschelon's contract. The Team agreed to consider these concerns as it continues to discuss improvements to Qwest's Change Management Process.

CLOSING OF AUGUST 14 WORKING SESSION
Lee closed the working session preparing the Team for Thursday's session. She asked that participants bring frameworks from other ILECs, the redlined Qwest framework, OBF Issue 2233 version 1 document and redlined version 2 document. On Thursday the Team will address Types of Changes, Change Request and Changes to Existing Interfaces from the version 1 document.

She clarified that the Team will look at all frameworks. Lee also mentioned that locations for the October, November and December meetings will be discussed on Thursday.

Stichter-Eschelon proposed that on the first day of the 2-day working session, the session starts one hour later at 10 am and end at 5 pm to allow traveling the morning of the first day. There will be a working lunch on the first day. The Team agreed with this approach.

DAY 2: AUGUST 16 WORKING SESSION
The second day of the working session began with roll call—refer to Attachment 1 for Attendance Record. Lee reiterated the protocol to state name and company before making a statement. She reviewed the Updated August 16 Agenda (Attachment 2a) based on input from August 14. The updated agenda and meeting material were emailed to participants and posted on the CICMP Re-design web site. Printed copies were also available at the session.

REVIEW ISSUES AND ACTION ITEMS LOG
The Team discussed the following Action Items:

- Procedures for Voting and the Impasse Resolution Process—draft Proposal (Item #45 and #46)
- Monthly Meeting Re-named to CMP from CICMP (Item #9)
- Move 12/19 Monthly CMP Meeting to 12/12 (Item #28)
- Determine location for October, November and December working sessions (#27)

Item #45 and #46: Draft Proposal—Procedures for Voting and the Impasse Resolution Process (refer to Attachment 7a)
Lee reviewed the proposed Procedures for Voting and Impasse Resolution Process with the Team. Clauson-Eschelon questioned what does "when a specific issue at a specific agenda" mean. Routh-Qwest clarified that the items to be voted on will be presented ahead of the meeting. Gindlesberger-Covad requested a timeframe for when an Agenda is issued. Lee stated that an Agenda is issued a week in advance of the working session. Lee will add language at the end of the first paragraph to address the advance notice of items pending a vote. Bahner-AT&T wanted to confirm that her action item to come up with CLEC – CLEC dead-lock process for September 5th meeting. Lee confirmed that Bahner-AT&T took an action item on August 14 to lead the effort with the CLEC community to develop a process to break-through a dead-lock among the CLEC participants. Routh-Qwest had a question on whether to narrow down to two positions was the right number. Clauson-Eschelon indicated that the language states, "attempt to." Gindlesberger-Covad asked if the 2nd and 3rd bullets can be eliminated and the purpose of a vote among the CLEC participants is to come up with one position. Evans-Sprint felt we need more than one position. Gindlesberger-Covad stated that the CLEC participants owe it to Qwest to come up with one. He also wanted to reword bullet 4 by deleting "still" and "two." Schultz-Qwest stated that in the first page, last paragraph she was concerned over limiting Qwest's participation. Gindlesberger-Covad stated that the bullets above relieve that issue. Clauson-Eschelon indicated that the sentence structure appears incorrect – need to reword. Van Meter-AT&T clarified that the initial caucus is to get the CLECs to agree. Ric Martin-Qwest suggested that the bullets be broken-up and place the verbiage next to the appropriate bullets. It was agreed that this should be done throughout the document. Clauson-Eschelon requested a correction from "of an issue" to "on an issue" throughout the document. Van Meter-AT&T requested that when a writer adds wording after the fact, the document should state "suggested by" before the language. Gindlesberger-Covad requested that the phrase "freeze period" be changed to "tabled." He also suggested that if the bullet subject is sufficient, we do not need to add additional verbiage. Lee will remove text paragraph under CLEC – Qwest on page 2. Gindlesberger-Covad requested a change from "freeze period" to "tabled" in the second bullet – Impasse Resolution. Bahner-AT&T had a question on the meaning of "AT&T Lead." Lee clarified that the action item notation will be replaced with Bahner-AT&T and CLECs language on September 5. Schultz-Qwest requested a change from "Arbitrator" to "Mediator." Clauson-Eschelon felt that the Team must agree to using either a Arbitrator or Mediator. Eschelon doesn't want to limit the 3rd Party to Mediator, because Qwest in the past has used Arbitrators. She emphasized that all parties must agree to terms and costs. Clauson-Eschelon suggested a change from "State Commission" to "Regulator." *[Eschelon COMMENT: It states: "Clauson-Eschelon felt that the Team must agree to using either a Arbitrator or Mediator. Eschelon doesn't want to limit the 3rd Party to Mediator, because Qwest in the past has used Arbitrators. She emphasized that all parties must agree to terms and costs. Clauson-Eschelon suggested a change from "State Commission" to "Regulator." The Team agreed to Regulator, 3rd Party and no LOA designee allowed to represent another company." The first sentence is correct, but it is a*

shorthand version that could easily be misread to mean that we must use one or the other (when in fact we were all saying it should not be limited). It would be more clear to state: "Clauson-Eschelon said that, before an arbitrator or mediator may be used, the parties must agree on this approach. Because agreement is required, a party will not be forced to use an arbitrator or mediator if the party prefers another approach."] The Team agreed to Regulator, 3rd Party and no LOA designee allowed to represent another company. Schultz-Qwest wanted further discussion within Qwest to address the dispute resolution process. Lee reviewed the Voting Tally Form. Everybody agreed to remove names on the form. Gindlesberger-Covad wanted a positive affirmation in the LOA column. It was agreed to change the Share Results column header to, "Share Results? (Yes or No)" and correct the footnote. Lee will update the procedures and issue with meeting minutes. Clauson-Eschelon requested to change the verbiage in the instructions to match the form. Lee advised that the above discussion closed out action items 45 and 46.

Item 9: Rename Monthly Meeting from CICMP to CMP
Schultz-Qwest presented the name change at the August 15 Monthly CMP Meeting. The CLEC attendees agreed to the name change. This item is closed. Stichter-Eschelon requested to change the Log to read "CICMP to CMP."

Item 28 – Move 12/19 Monthly Meeting to 12/12:
Schultz-Qwest stated that the CLECs agreed to change the December Monthly Meeting to 12/12. This action item is closed.

Item 27 – Location for October, November and December CMP Re-design Working Sessions:
The Team agreed that the meetings for the CMP re-design will be held in Minneapolis for October 2nd & 3rd and 30th & 31st. All other meetings were agreed to be held in Denver, Colorado. Refer to the last attachment for the schedule of future working sessions.

Other Item:
Powers-Eschelon mentioned that a Eschelon repairperson received a mail-out stating that a conference call will be held on a weekly basis (every Thursday). Eschelon was not clear on the purpose of the weekly Thursday calls. Clauson-Eschelon suggested to add an Agenda with the mail-outs. Schultz-Qwest is following up on this item outside of the re-design effort.

REVIEW OF OBF ISSUE 2233 (a1v1) VERSION 1 FRAMEWORK
Lee stated that the verbiage agreed to today will be incorporated into the August 8, 2001 redlined document. She provided an update on the OBF meetings in Boston to complete a preliminary proposal on Change Management for OSS. The OBF subcommittee is rearranging version 2 to achieve a better flow of the process and incorporating details from version 1. Lee will issue the preliminary OBF Change Management proposal (a2v2) to this Team when she receives the document early next week.

Types of Changes
Lee advised that OBF is removing the numbers in the Types and going with name only – Production Support (Severity Types), Regulatory, Industry Guidelines, Provider Originated and Customer Originated. She explained that Production Support applies to a systems release that was recently implemented, not day-to-day operational issues. Evans-Sprint indicated that BellSouth also has a type of change called "defect." She continued that Sprint acknowledges defects under the Production Support type, not a type by itself.

Production Support
Powers-Eschelon wanted clarification on whether the definition meant one or all CLECs impacted. Lee advised that OBF defines it as all users are affected. Powers-Eschelon wanted to know what is Qwest's definition. Lee indicated that an ILEC will address impacts to one CLEC on a case-by-case basis. Powers-Eschelon would like to have a timeframe by Qwest for handling the case-by-case situation. Lee advised that this would be handled through the normal escalation process. Powers-Eschelon wanted to make sure it is being handled properly. Jeff Thompson-

Qwest advised that where a CLEC has a problem and there is no work-around this would be classified as a Severity 2. He further clarified Qwest's internal Severity Levels as:

- Severity 1 – System is down.
- Severity 2 – Significant impact to a functionality that is critical to business and there is no work around.
- Severity 3 - Significant impact to a functionality that is critical to business and a work around is available.
- Severity 4 – All others

Clauson-Eschelon wanted clarification on designation of systems and/or Product & Process. Should the Team address system changes for Product & Process as we address them for Systems? Lee advised that the intent of Change Management is to cover interfaces and functionality. Powers-Eschelon indicated that the Team needs to come back to backend system if we are only addressing interfaces. Thompson-Qwest stated that the Team needs to address functionality and Qwest can commit to making a change to functionality. Clauson-Eschelon stated that during discussion on Scope, it was agreed to that Systems directly or indirect affects CLECs. Schultz-Qwest clarified that the Team didn't come to an agreement on what is included in "directly or indirectly" but agreed to address functions impacted. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the Team can't wait until later to define Types – the Team needs to address functions impacted now. Thompson-Qwest indicated that Qwest can only commit to interfaces, but the functionality issues are tied to interfaces. Powers-Eschelon, questioned whether we only tie types of Application Interfaces. Clauson-Eschelon suggested that the Team define "Application Interfaces" to include functions that directly or indirectly affecting CLECs. Thompson-Qwest agreed to identify functions. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the CLECs need validation of parity – a system release that gets modified by Retail impacts the CLEC. Thompson-Qwest agreed to name functions, but would not address the question on determination of parity. Clauson-Eschelon agreed that Eschelon does not want to name systems, or use parity. Eschelon stated that Verizon uses OSS and Qwest uses Application. Lee advised that an industry guideline for application means gateway to gateway and OSS is general interfaces. Thompson-Qwest agreed to Pre-Order, Ordering, Provisioning, Maintenance & Repair and Billing functions. Clauson-Eschelon felt functions may be appropriate. The Team agreed that a definition for interfaces is needed. CLECs requested a caucus during lunch to develop a definition on "interfaces."

After lunch, Osborne-Miller-AT&T reviewed the CLECs proposed definition of OSS Interfaces.

> OSS interfaces include Gateways, connectivity, Qwest's Backend and Legacy system, and Qwest's Retail Systems that affect the Pre-Order, Order, provisioning, maintenance/repair and billing functions provided to CLECs.

Thompson-Qwest does not agree to the backend and legacy systems and Qwest Retail Systems. He could accept the functions provided by the systems in support of Pre-Order, Ordering/Provisioning, Maintenance/Repairs and Billing. Clauson-Eschelon wanted to use systems. Thompson-Qwest advised that system functions are acceptable, but not systems. Gindlesberger-Covad expressed concern if the reference to systems is eliminated. Clauson-Eschelon stated she was comfortable with system functions. Gindlesberger-Covad would accept "systems function" if all other CLECs were in agreement. Clauson-Eschelon requested that there is reference to retail offerings. Thompson-Qwest didn't want to accept this and felt the parity issue should be addressed outside the CMP discussions. Lee stated that the Change Management Process doesn't manage the parity issue, but manages changes to system functionality. Clauson-Eschelon stated that this is for the CLECs to decide. Qwest advised that the testing of parity is outside the CMP. Clauson-Eschelon indicated that there needs to be an automatic way to notice changes to Retail systems because this is a system change that affects CLECs. Thompson-Qwest stated that there are regulatory obligations, new products, etc. that have appropriate notifications. The CMP does not determine if there is parity or not. The CMP addresses a change that may have resulted from Retail functionality changes. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Eschelon doesn't disagree on the above, but believes that CLECs should get notifications on changes Qwest makes to Retail. Thompson-Qwest stated that CLECs will be notified on Retail driven

changes that impact CLEC interfaces. Clauson-Eschelon suggested adding, "as required by law" at the end. *[Eschelon COMMENT: it states: "Clauson-Eschelon suggested adding, "as required by law" Actually, Jeff (Thompson) suggested language referring to statutes, etc., and the person on the phone expressed a concern about that language. So, I replied with this language in an attempt to address both of their suggestions].* Schultz-Qwest wanted to change, "includes" to "as defined."

Discussion pursued on language and the following definition was agreed to:

> Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application and GUI), connectivity, and system functions that support, or affect the pre-order, order/provisioning, maintenance/repair and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

Powers-Eschelon questioned whether a customer-originated change for regulatory changes is automatically placed on the list of changes or not. Thompson-Qwest responded that if it is determined to be a regulatory change, then yes.

Industry Guidelines
Clauson-Eschelon asked if there were any other Industry bodies besides ATIS. Thompson-Qwest advised that there is American National Standards Institute (ANSI). Schultz-Qwest asked Thompson-Qwest if Qwest implements changes before approved by an industry body. Thompson-Qwest advised that Qwest may implement changes before approval by an industry body. The Team agreed to go back individually and ascertain whether there are any additional governing bodies that need to be included.

Qwest Originated Changes
Clauson-Eschelon requested a change from "Interfaces" to "OSS Interfaces" and delete everything after that in the sentence.

CLEC Originated Changes
The Team agreed to change "Interfaces" to "OSS Interfaces" and delete everything after that in the sentence. Schultz-Qwest advised that manual and business process need to be addressed in the "Process" discussions at a later date.

Tracking Change Requests
Lee advised that this was covered in the redline document.

Change Request Initiation Process
Schultz-Qwest requested that in Customer Originated Request, 1st paragraph, and 1st sentence change "via e-mail" to "electronically." She introduced the new process that is being implemented on holding clarification meetings with the originator after receipt of a Change Request. Schultz-Qwest also started the development of flow charts and procedures for handling Change Request. It was agreed that this section will be tabled until the September 5 meeting and Qwest will issue draft procedures by August 28.

Change to Existing Interfaces
The Team agreed to change "Interfaces" in the Title to "Pre-Order and Order Application-to-Application." Thompson-Qwest clarified that an EDI change calls for a CLEC to make a change on their side of the application, therefore there is a need for Qwest to maintain two versions of software. On the other hand, a GUI change does not require a CLEC to make any interface changes; therefore there is not a need for Qwest to maintain two GUI versions. He wanted to limit it to application-to-application, pre-order and order. Thompson-Qwest to incorporate the SGAT language for versioning in the redlined CMP re-design document. Schultz-Qwest advised that a development view will be shared with the CLECs on a quarterly basis at the first monthly meeting. Clauson-Eschelon indicated that the presentation of the quarterly view allows for discussion. Schultz-Qwest asked the CLECs if they wanted a 12-month view. Thompson-Qwest

advised that they can provide a 12-month view based on a release calendar, however, details will only be available for the first two releases. Clauson-Eschelon suggested that Qwest provide what they use, or write what would be more beneficial for this section. It was agreed that Qwest will provide the write-up for pages 32, 33 and 39 to 41. Osborne-Miller-AT&T wants Qwest's proposal based on what is coming out of OBF. The Team agreed to bring in the CLEC's SME (also 3rd party software vendor if appropriate) for the discussion on Qwest's proposal on September 6.

Severity Levels (see Attachment 10)
Thompson-Qwest reviewed Qwest's internal Severity Levels—a copy was provided to attendees. Clauson-Eschelon expressed concern that when only one CLEC has a problem, they believe it is higher than a Severity Level 3.*[Eschelon COMMENT: "expressed concern" should be "said."]* Osborne-Miller-AT&T asked how would a CLEC know when another CLEC calls in on the same problem. Thompson-Qwest indicated that the tracking system has diagnostics that identifies similar problems and notifies the technician on the severity level. Also, the Trouble Ticketing System has rules to combine tickets and secondly, when the IT Help Desk can't solve the problem, the IMA contact gets paged and he/she would be aware if there are similar problems. Evans-Sprint requested that defects are added to the Severity Level list. Thompson-Qwest states that the definition on the front page describes defects, but the Team should not limit to defects. Thompson-Qwest already took an action item from the Wednesday, August 15 CMP Meeting to write-up the IT Help Desk process by next Friday. He explained the difference between Severity Levels. Thompson-Qwest mentioned that the IT Help Desk assigns the initial severity level. If after 30 minutes the IT Help Desk can't clear the trouble, the ticket is referred to the IMA subject matter experts. Clauson-Eschelon concluded that the Team needed to decide whether to adopt Qwest's internal severity levels or those outlined in the OBF version 1 framework. *[Eschelon COMMENT: it states: "Clauson-Eschelon concluded that the Team needed to decide whether to adopt Qwest's internal severity levels or those outlined in the OBF version 1 framework." This should be "Clauson-Eschelon said that the Team needs to first decide whether to adopt the number of severity levels outlined by Qwest or the number outlined by OBF before considering the language to go with each level."]* Schultz-Qwest requested that the Team adopts Qwest's four severity levels because that is Qwest's current practice. Evans-Sprint still wanted defects addressed in the severity levels. Thompson-Qwest indicated that he could add "(including defects)" to the definition.

Action Items:

- #49: Identify other industry bodies to include in Type 3 changes
- #50: Present procedures for CR process
- #51: Obtain SGAT language for versioning release language
- #52: Create language for Changes to Existing Interfaces based on OBF v2a2 framework
- #53: Incorporate language and proposed changes/improvements to the CMP
- #59: Share the results of the August OBF subcommittee meeting (Issue 2233 a2v2)

CLOSING OF THE AUGUST 16 WORKING SESSION
Lee recapped that Qwest is to provide its write-up on CR Initiation Process and Changes to Existing Interfaces. She stated that the requirements review will include GUI. Schultz-Qwest proposed that where they have existing language throughout the CMP, they will provide by August 29th, but at a minimum will include what Judy Lee indicated. Clauson-Eschelon requested that Qwest Originated Changes be handled the same as CLEC Originated Changes. Lee advised that Qwest will also provide a proposal on the Exception Process. Schultz-Qwest stated that the proposal will use the process provided by Evans-Sprint, as a guideline. Lee mentioned that the Prioritization and Exception processes will be reviewed at the September 5 and 6 meetings.

The Team agreed that we would not conduct the audit process at the end of each working session. Draft minutes will be issued by close of business Tuesday, August 21. Input from the Team is due Thursday, August 23 at close of business with final minutes distributed and posted on Monday, August 27.

Action Item:

- #55: timeline for DRAFT and FINAL meeting minutes as stated above.

Attachment 1

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design Working Session

August 14 and 16 ATTENDANCE RECORD

Core Team Members

8/14	8/16	Company	Last Name	First Name	Email	Phone	Comments
X		Allegiance Telecom	Wicks	Terry	terry.wicks@algx.com	469-259-4438	
X	X	AT&T	Bahner	Terry	Tbahner@att.com	303-298-6149	
X	X	AT&T	Osborne-Miller	Donna	dosborne@att.com	303-298-6178	
X	X	AT&T	Van Meter	Sharon	svanmeter@att.com	303-298-6178	
X	X	Avista	Thiessen	Jim	jthiessen@avistacom.net	509-444-4089	
X	X	Covad Communications	Gindlesberger	Larry	Lgindles@covad.com	330-209-5499	
		Electric Light Wave	Gunderson	Peder	peder_gunderson@eli.net	360-816-3429	
X	X	Eschelon Telecom	Clauson	Karen	klclauson@eschelon.com	612-436-6026	
X	X	Eschelon Telecom	Powers	Lynne	flpowers@eschelon.com	612-436-6642	
X	X	Eschelon Telecom	Stichter	Kathy	klstichter@eschelon.com	612-436-6022	
		Integra	Littler	Bill	blittler@integratelecom.com	503-793-5923	
		McLeod	Sprague	Michelle	msprague@mcleodusa.com	319-790-7402	
X		Qwest	Green	Wendy	Wteepe@qwest.com	303-382-8124	
		Qwest	Maher	Jim	Jxmaher@qwest.com	303-896-5637	
X	X	Qwest	Rossi	Matt	mrossi@uswest.com	303-896-5432	
X	X	Qwest	Routh	Mark	mrouth@uswest.com	303-896-3781	
X	X	Qwest	Schultz	Judy	jmschu4@qwest.com	303-965-3725	
	X	Qwest	Thompson	Jeff	jlthomp@qwest.com	303-896-7276	
X	X	SBC Telecom	Lees	Marcia	Marcia.lees@sbc.com	314-340-1131	
		Scindo Networks	DeGarlais	Vince	vcedegarlais@scindonetworks.com	720-528-4207	
		Scindo Networks	Gavrilis	George	Gtgavrilis@scindonetworks.com	720-528-4193	
X	X	Sprint	Evans	Sandy	sandra.k.evans@mail.sprint.com	913-433-8499	
		WorldCom	Balvin	Liz	liz.balvin@wcom.com	303-217-7305	
X	X	WorldCom	Hines	LeiLani	LeiLani.Jean.Hines@wcom.com	303 217-7340	

Other Participants

Attachment 1

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design Working Session

August 14 and 16 ATTENDANCE RECORD

8/14	8/16	Company	Last Name	First Name	Email	Phone	Comments
		Accenture	Powell	Mark			
		Colorado PUC	Quintana	Becky			
X	X	KPMG Consulting	Nobs	Christian	cnobs@kpmg.com	415-831-1323	
X	X	KPMG Consulting	Yeung	Shun (Sam)	shunyeung@kpmg.com	212-954-6351	
X		Qwest	LeMon	Lynne	Llemon@qwest.com	303-965-6321	
X	X	Qwest	Martin	Ric	Rhmart2@qwest.com	303-896-9823	Scribe

Facilitator

X	X	XTel Solutions, Inc.	Lee	Judy	soytofu@pacbell.net	650-743-8597	

Attachment 2

Working Session to Negotiate
A Modified Change Management Process

Tuesday, August 14 and Thursday, August 16, 2001
9 am to 5 pm Mountain Time
1005-17th Street, 1st Floor, Junior Board Room, Denver, CO

Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304 passcode: 7101617 (hit #)

AGENDA

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction	Judy Schultz, Qwest
• Review Core Team Membership	
• Review Agenda	Judy Lee, Facilitator
Discussion and Status	All
• Issues and Action Items:	
– Naming Convention for Notices (Actions #13B, #14F, #14G—Judy Schultz)	
– Notification Process Plan (Actions #13C, #13F—Jarby Blackmun)	
– Sample of "Report" (Actions #11B, #11C—Judy Schultz)	
– Others (Actions #1-H, #9, #13-D, #13-E, #16, #27, #28, #29)	
– Voting Tally Form (proposal)	
• Feedback on August 7-8 Meeting Minutes and Discussion Elements:	
– CMP Meeting Distribution Package	
– Wholesale Web Site	
– Others	
• Managed Changes—Existing Interface	
• Prioritization	
• Exception Process	
Next Session	All
• Determine discussion items for the next working session	
• Determine what supporting material is needed for the next session	
Quick Fix Implementation	Judy Schultz
Closing Remarks	Judy Schultz
Adjourn	

Attachment 2a

Working Session to Negotiate
A Modified Change Management Process

Thursday, August 16, 2001
9 am to 5 pm Mountain Time
1005-17th Street, 1st Floor, Junior Board Room, Denver, CO

Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304 passcode: 7101617 (hit #)

UPDATED AGENDA

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction (9 am – 9:15 am)	Judy Schultz, Qwest
• Review Core Team Membership	
• Review Agenda	Judy Lee, Facilitator
Discussion and Status	All
• Issues and Action Items: (9:15 am to 10 am)	
– Procedure for Voting and Impasse Resolution Process (Item #46)	
– Monthly Meeting Re-name to CMP from CICMP (Item #9)	
– Move 12/19 Monthly CMP Meeting to 12/12 (Item #28)	
– Determine location for Oct, Nov and Dec sessions (Item #27)	
10 am – 10:15 am Break	
10 am – 3pm (Lunch: 11:30 am to 12:30 pm)	
• Types of Change (see OBF 2233 version 1, pp. 6-9)	
• Change Request Initiation Process (see OBF 2233 version 1, pp. 10-11)	
• Change to Existing Interfaces (see OBF 2233 version 1, pp. 14-15)	
• Exception Process (see AT&T's email: SBC CMP section 6.3 page 27	
Next Session (3 pm to 3:30 pm)	All
• Determine discussion items for the next working session	
• Determine what supporting material is needed for the next session	
Quick Fix Implementation (3:30 pm – 3:45 pm)	Judy Schultz
Closing Remarks (3:45 pm to 4 pm)	Judy Schultz
• Audit 2-day session	
Adjourn	

Attachment 3

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
11C	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	CLECs have a need to see one document/report containing all information (single point of reference). For example, CR/RN Logs need to include originator, title, description, history and status, so that individual CRs and RNs do not need to be included in Monthly Meeting package. CRs also need to include actual response/s and decision. Present a sample distribution package for review with updated tracking documents	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	Proposal to CMP Re-design Core Team for review; target rollout to CLEC community at the 9/19 Monthly CMP meeting.
13C	Action	August 7 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Provide location (link) where all notification documents are kept – Wholesale web site	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~August 14~~ Extended Sep 18	Related to "screen shots" action item taken on 8/14
13D	Action	August 7 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Add English title to all new and existing CRs posted on the CICMP web site	Qwest – Mark Routh Matt Rossi	September 5	
13F	Action	August 8 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Develop timeframe to roll-out web site and mail-out process	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~August 14~~ Extended Sep 18	Jarby Blackmun and Judy Schultz to share screen shots of the web site to re-design team. PENDING: Status given on 9/5

Attachment 3

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
13G	Action	August 8 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Re-visit the redlined CMP framework element, "Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site" at a later working session.	Core Team	Sep 20	Re-visit this element to insure all items are addressed in the re-designed CMP framework.
14D	Action	August 7 Meeting	Notification Process	Take existing system, product and process notification and modify to match proposed naming convention to obtain one single naming convention for all notifications	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
17A	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Scope	Qwest expressed concern that the Scope needs further clarification. Qwest will propose language to re-visit the Scope at a future session.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	September 20	
17B	Issue	August 7 Meeting	Scope	Describe Qwest's position for systems and functionality supported in the current CMP process (i.e., EXACT, HEET)	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
17C	Action	August 7 Meeting	Scope	Dialogue on introduction and scope to seek input from CLECs to prepare for Qwest's proposal on September 20th	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	Agenda item for September 5
23	Action	August 7 Meeting	Upcoming Event Calendar	Provide an "up coming" events page on the CICMP web site that includes all monthly meetings, re-design meetings and any other interim ad hoc meetings/calls	Qwest – Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	September 5	
24	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP POC List	Establish a CMP POC list (primary and alternate POC) and post on web site	Qwest— Judy Schultz	September 5	Provide team with status on 8/14

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
30	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Add Meeting Agenda, material, dates to web site CMP category	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	
31	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Change category Ordering to Ordering/Provisioning and Repair to Repair/Maintenance	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	
32	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Add Raw Loop Data Tool to the IMA GUI section of web site categories for Systems	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	
33	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Add another sub-category of "Other" for systems with possible expansion later after re-visit of the scope discussion.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	
34	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Investigate adding back end systems to the sub categories of the Systems notifications on the web site (WFA, TIRKS, etc)	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	
35	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Add "procedures" as a sub category (2) to the Process section	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	This is to include any joint procedures that involve both the CLEC and Qwest – e.g., repair and exchange of CLEC owned equipment
36	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Add "Tariffs" as a main category in the proposed matrix	Qwest—Judy Schultz	September 5	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
37	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Investigate the possibility of housing all RNs, CRs and Training information in one location and providing multiple methods in which this information is accessed on the web site. Example, this can be a search by number or search by category	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
38	Issue	August 14 Meeting	Notifications	Identify designated owner or point of contact for the mail outs to contact with problems – example web sites listed with in-active URLs	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
39	Issue	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Provide screen shots of the web site to give visual representation	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
40	Issue	August 14 Meeting	Notifications	Are Call Center outages included in the "outages" sub-category – should they be?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
41	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Add the Re-Design page on the CMP section of the Proposed Release Notification matrix	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
42	Action	August 14 Meeting	Notification	Investigate how notifications are done for Network outages, including a paging broadcast capability.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	
43	Action	August 14 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Investigate possibilities for displaying (posting) and sorting Sub-category 3 of the web site	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	Will it be by serial number, by date, etc.?

Attachment 3

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
44	Action	August 14 Meeting	Notification	Create instructions for access to web site notification	Qwest - Judy Schultz	September 5	
48	Action	August 14 Meeting	Voting	Determine how to reach resolution within the CLEC community if impasse were to occur – present draft proposal	AT&T - Terri Bahner	September 5	
49	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of changes – OBF V.1	Look at other industry bodies that need to be included in type 3 changes (e.g., ANSI and ATIS)	Core Team	September 5	
50	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of Changes – OBF V.1	Present change request flow chart, form, and procedures for CR handling	Qwest – Judy Schultz	August 24	Send via email to participants for review; agenda item for Sep 5
51	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of Changes – OBF V.1	Obtain SGAT language for versioning release language	Qwest – Judy Schultz	August 29	Incorporate into Qwest's proposed CMP framework
52	Action	August 16 Meeting	OBF V. 1	Create language in OBF version 1 in Change to Existing Interfaces section VII. Also address 'defects.'	Qwest – Judy Schultz	August 29	Incorporate into Qwest's proposed CMP framework
53	Action	August 16 Meeting	Qwest CMP Process Document	Revise Qwest CICMP process document to incorporate added language and proposed changes/improvements to the overall process to provide a basis for comparison and discussion with the CMP Re-Design Core Team.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	August 29	Incorporate into Qwest's proposed CMP framework
54	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes	Add action item verbiage to the meeting minutes as opposed to referencing the action items document	Qwest – Judy Schultz	September 5	Begin with the August 14 and 16 meeting minutes

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
55	Action	August 16 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Review	What is the timeline for DRAFT and FINAL 8/14 and 8/16 Meeting Minutes and material?	Qwest—Judy Schultz	~~August 27 Noon~~ Extended to August 31	DECISION: – DRAFT Meeting Minutes and materials (by ~~Tues, 8/21~~ Fri, 8/24) – Distribute DRAFT to 8/14 and 8/16 re-design participants for review (by ~~Tues, 8/21~~ Fri, 8/24 COB) – Participants provide Mark Routh with corrections/additions (~~Thurs, 8/23~~ Tues, 8/28 COB) – FINAL Meeting Minutes and materials to be distributed and posted on CMP Re-design web site (by ~~Monday, 8/27~~ Fri, 8/31) Qwest extended timeline on 8/21.
56	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Update	Revise August 7-8 Final Meeting Minutes to: – Change "CLEC" to "Co-Provider" in the word CICMP on page 3, paragraph 4 – Correct name to "Wicks" – Correct Evans-Sprint comments to "responses to CRs are sent to the originator via email, not posted on the web site."	Qwest—Jim Maher	September 5	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

CLOSED ISSUES and ACTION ITEMS (items in BLUE were closed at the last working session)

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1A	Issue	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider Role	What role do 3rd Party Providers play in this re-design effort? a) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client [Process=Yes, Vote=No] b) 3rd Party Providers are allowed to 'voice' and 'vote' as any CLEC in this re-design effort [Process and Vote=Yes] c) 3rd Party Providers are excluded from the core team [Process and Vote=No] d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client with an LOA [Process=Yes, and Vote=Yes for CLEC client, Vote = No for themselves]	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process; however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client if a Letter of Authorization is in effect. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1B	Action	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider	Core Team to conclude discussion and participants to decide on one of the above scenarios	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED in July 19 meeting.
1C	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Can a CLEC represent another CLEC on Voting for CMP re-design process?	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: Yes, if a Letter of Authorization is in place for a specific session and on specific issues. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.
1D	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Voting	If a CLEC or core team member is absent, how do we handle the vote?	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: It is a CLEC's responsibility to have a same CLEC backup, or a LOA in place with an alternate.
1E	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Create a standard voting form	Qwest -- Mark Routh	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Voting form created and will be included in the draft meeting minutes for 8/7-8/8 session
1F	Action	July 19 Meeting	LOA	Create a standard for LOA for topic, meeting, and date to be used during the re-design sessions.	Qwest - Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: LOA presented, discussed and agreed upon during the 8/7 Meeting.
1G	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Define rules for a quorum when a 'vote' is required	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: - Quorum is defined as 51% of the present Core Team Members - Majority vote by present Core Team Members carries the decision

Attachment 3

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1H	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Seek written permission from July 19 participants if 3rd Party Provider voting results can be posted on the web site as part of the FINAL meeting notes.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED August 16	Participating CLECs (SBC Telecom not available) provided permission for Qwest to include voting results as part of the FINAL 7/19 Meeting Minutes COMPLETED: SBC Telecom gives permission to publish its 7/19 voting result.
2	Action	July 11 Meeting	Baseline Document	Create a single document that inserts CLEC comments on areas for improvement in Qwest's CMP into the appropriate sections of the OBF 2233 version 2 framework	Judy Lee	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: A tool for the working session is posted on the web site
3	Action	July 11 Meeting	Agenda Items	Schedule agenda items/elements for future working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: See schedule of working sessions on the web site
4	Action	July 11 Meeting	Working Session Location	Decide the location for September working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: All sessions will be hosted by Qwest and held in Denver, CO
5	Action	July 11 Meeting	CICMP Redesign Web Site	Enhance the CICMP web site to include the CMP Redesign information	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED. See CICMP web site for "CICMP Redesign"
6	Issue	July 19 Meeting	CMP Redesign Material	What is the process to share CMP redesign material with the CLEC community?	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Draft minutes and material will be shared with the core team participants for input. Afterwards, Qwest will finalize the minutes and post on the web site. CLECs will be notified about the posting.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							DECISION: Participants decided that Qwest should issue a notice referring CLECs to the web site for meeting minutes, handouts and agenda for next meeting. The handouts will not be attached to the notice.
7A	Action	July 11 Meeting	Post CLEC Comments on Web Site	CLEC requested that Qwest post all CLEC comments on the CICMP Re-design web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Matrix is posted on the web site
7B	Action	July 11 Meeting	Written Permission to Post CLEC Comments	Seek clearance in writing from individual CLECs to post their comments on the CICMP Redesign web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 13	COMPLETED: CLECs that provided comments allowed Qwest to post on web site
8	Action	July 19 Meeting	Notice and Distribution Lists	Provide guidelines for CLEC notifications and distribution list - Ease-of-use - Comment/Reply process including web site option to comment - Contact information - Identify limitations on contact information: proprietary, open-to-participant, or open-to-all	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Established four categories for notices to facilitate notification efficiency.
9	Action	July 19 Meeting	Re-name	Do we need to rename ~~CMP to CICMP~~ CICMP to CMP? Rename co-provider to CLEC?	Core Team	CLOSED August 16	DECISION (7/19): Qwest will rename co-provider to CLEC and provider to Qwest.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							DECISION (8/7): Recommendation to rename from CICMP to CMP will be presented at 8/15 CMP Meeting DECISION: (8/15) CLECs agreed to change CICMP to CMP
10	Action	July 19 Meeting	ATIS	Research what ASOG activities are being worked on at ATIS.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: ATIS is not developing a Change Management process that includes ASRs. Related to Issue #17B.
11A	Action	July 19 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	Determine what to include in the CMP meeting distribution packages.	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	COMPLETED: REDLINED CMP re-design framework will reflect results of discussion.
11B	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	Qwest to provide a sample of the "report" containing information for CMP meeting.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Judy Schultz presented example report and CLECs accepted the 'report' concept.
12	Action	July 19 Meeting	Walk-On Agenda Items	Add walk-on item to the end of each CMP meeting agenda.	Qwest—Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: Qwest will add walk-on items to the end of each agenda, as appropriate, starting with the August 15 meeting
13A	Action	July 19 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Review CICMP web-site and suggest potential changes and guidelines	Core team	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Included in 8/8 redlined CMP framework

CLEC-Qwest-Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
13B	Action	August 7 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Can Qwest display new naming convention on the CICMP web site (CRs and RNs)—e.g., Ability to click category and receive next sub category?	Qwest – Judy Schultz/ Core Team	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Closed on proposals for sub-category under the 4 categories (Systems, Product, Process and Network) Qwest is able to display naming convention on web site
13E	Action	August 8 Meeting	CICMP Web Site	Qwest to determine how to time-stamp each web site page (whenever the page is updated on the web site)	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	Qwest is currently doing this today and will continue on all updated pages
14A	Action	July 19 Meeting	Notification Process	Discuss guidelines for the notification process at the next session.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Refer to re-worded Action #14C.
14B	Action	August 7 Meeting	Notification Process	Explore functionality and capability of the "mail out" tool used for Product/ Process notifications.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 8	COMPLETED: "Mail-outs" are not on the web site—pending closure on the categories and sub-categories from Core Team (see Item #13B)
14C	Action	Updated August 7 Meeting (7/19)	Notification Process	Using proposed naming convention, build a matrix of possible combinations for RN titles.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: CLECs provided upgrades to Judy Schultz' proposal. As a result of this discussion, opened Item #14D
14E	Issue	August 8 Meeting	Notification Process	What category (i.e., 4 category) should be used to notify CLECs of the introduction of a new product? Should Qwest send one notice addressing product and process, or two separate, but redundant notices	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: Qwest to send a Product notice and a separate Process notice with the same content information— redundant notices with different category and name on the subject

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				(i.e., one for Product and another for Process but with the same content)?			line.
14F	Action	August 8 Meeting	Notification Process	Provide proposals for sub-categories (e.g., Product Family) under each notice category (Systems, Product, Process and Network) and links.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Web Site modification rollout is dependent on proposal for sub-categories—see Item 14C. Presented and closed during 8/14 Re-Design meeting
16	Action	July 19 Meeting	Qwest Comments on MATRIX	Include Qwest comments on the MATRIX (OBF Issue 2233 with CLEC Comments)	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Included Qwest's proposal on the MATRIX.
15	Action	July 19 Meeting	Notice	Research source and readability of event notifications (software applications)	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: System outages and event notifications are now being released in a "doc" format.
18	Action	July 19 Meeting	PIDs	Liz Balvin/Worldcom will provide the Core Team members with the latest PIDs for Change Management.	Liz Balvin/ Worldcom	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Liz Balvin sent PIDs on July 20th
19	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Contact Information	Eschelon requested that contact information for all participant be included on the CICMP Re-design web site	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Request from review of 7/19 DRAFT meeting notes and material COMPLETED: All contact information now included on the Re-Design page on the CICMP web site

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
20	Action	July 19 Meeting	Discussion Items under Issues/ Action Item Log	Eschelon requests to include on the agenda topics for discussion under Issues and Action Items Log	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Request from review of 7/19 DRAFT meeting notes and material COMPLETED: Updated 8/7-8/8 agenda
21A	Action	August 7 Meeting	Core Team	Establishing CMP Re-Design Core Team Membership	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Reviewed Core Team membership
21B	Action	August 7 Meeting	Core Team—Meeting Quorum	Establish Core Team Quorum at the beginning of each working session	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: Quorum determination will be added to the agenda and be determined by attendance at each working session
22	Issue	August 7 Meeting	Core Team—Expectations	Define Expectations of Core Team Membership	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: Core Team Expectations/ Responsibilities: - Dedicated resource to negotiate a new CMP process. - Core Team Members can be added at any time understanding the roles and responsibilities of a Core Team Member. - Core Team Members must commit to participate either in person, via conference call, or by LOA in each working session. - Core Team Membership will be revoked if 3 consecutive working sessions are missed. - Core Team member will not be

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							allowed to vote on any issue in which they did not participate.
25	Issue	August 8 Meeting	Quick Hit Fix	How should Qwest introduce some Change Management Process changes ahead of completing the re-design CMP effort?	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: Qwest will review any proposals with the CMP re-design Core Team members before communicating at a Monthly CMP Meeting. During the Monthly CMP Meeting, Qwest will let meeting attendees know who participated in designing the Quick Hit proposal. "Quick Hit Fix" will be a standing item for the Monthly CMP Meeting agenda.
26	Action	August 8 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Review	What is the timeline for DRAFT and FINAL 8/7-8/8 Meeting Minutes and material?	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: – DRAFT Meeting Minutes and materials (by Fri, 8/10 9am MT) – Distribute DRAFT to 8/7-8/8 re-design session participants for review (by Fri, 8/10 Noon MT) – Participants provide Matt Rossi with corrections/additions (Mon, 8/13 Noon MT) – FINAL Meeting Minutes and materials to be distributed and posted on CMP Re-design web site (by Tuesday, 8/14)

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
27	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Re-design Location	Determine location for the October, November and December re-design working session.	Core Team	CLOSED August 16	Qwest has tentatively reserved meeting rooms in Denver, Colorado DECISION: (8/16) October sessions will be held in Minneapolis, except for CMP week; November and December sessions will be held in Denver
28	Action	August 8 Meeting	Monthly CMP Meeting	Move December meeting to 12/12	Qwest—Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED August 16	COMPLETED: Monthly CMP meeting is moved to 12/12.
29	Action	August 8 Meeting	Exception Process	Share other ILEC Exception Process with 8/14 working session participants to be used as a base.	Sprint—Sandy Evans	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Sprint and AT&T brought samples.
45	Action	August 14 Meeting	Voting Tally Form	Incorporate Qwest's position on the Voting Tally Form	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 16	See Procedures for A Vote and Impasse Resolution Process (includes Voting Tally Form) on the CICMP Re-design web site
46	Action	August 14 Meeting	Voting	Draft a proposal for a voting procedure and contingency dispute resolution process for dead-lock	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 16	See proposed Procedures for A Vote and Impasse Resolution Process (includes Voting Tally Form) on the CICMP Re-design web site
57	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Update	Revise July 19 Final Meeting Minutes to include the voting results on the 3rd Party Provider	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 21	COMPLETED: Revised Final July 19 Meeting Minutes are posted on the CICMP

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions

Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				issue—on August 14, the last voting CLEC has given Qwest permission to publish its result.			Re-design web site.
58	Action	August 14 Meeting	Core Team Expectations	Update the document to: "New Core Team member will not be allowed to reopen a vote on any issue that has been decided on."	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 16	COMPLETED: Revised guidelines are posted on the CICMP Re-design web site.
59	Action	August 16 Meeting	OBF August, 2001 Framework	Share with the re-design team the results of OBF Issue 2233 subcommittee proposal—a2v2	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 21	COMPLETED: Sent via email to all re-design participants.

Proposed Naming Convention for Web and Formal Notice Subject Line

Revised--August 14, 2001

Web and Notice Subject Line	Web and Notice Subject Line	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only
Category	**Sub-Category 1**	**Sub-Category 2**	**Sub-Category 3**	**Effective Date**	**Document Number**	**Suffix (I=initial, Rn=Revision #)**
Product	LIS/Interconnection Collocation (Virtual, Physical) Unbundled Network Elements (UNE) Ancillary Resale Products and Services	Release Notification (RN), Descriptor Training, Descriptor	(does not apply)	Effective Date	Document #	Suffix
Process	Pre Ordering Ordering/Provisioning Billing Maintenance/Repair	(does not apply)	Release Notification (RN), Descriptor Training, Descriptor Joint Procedures, Descriptor	Effective Date	Document #	Suffix

Web and Notice Subject Line	Web and Notice Subject Line	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only
Category	**Sub-Category 1**	**Sub-Category 2**	**Sub-Category 3**	**Effective Date**	**Document Number**	**Suffix** (I=initial, Rn=Revision #)
Systems	Customer Electronic Maintenance and Repair (CEMR)	Release Notification (RN), Descriptor	(does not apply)	Effective Date	Document #	Suffix
	Exchange Access, Control, and Tracking (EXACT)	Training, Descriptor				
	Held, Escalated, and Expedited Tool (HEET)	Outages, Descriptor				
	Interconnect Mediated Access (IMA) Electronic Data Interchange (EDI)					
	IMA Graphical User Interface (GUI)					
	Mediated Access System (MEDIACC)					
	Product Database for Co-Providers (PCAT)					
	Telecommunications Information System (TELIS)					
	Wholesale Billing Interfaces - IABS and CRIS Summary Bill Outputs and Loss and Completion Records					
	Raw Loop Data Tool GUI					
	Other					
Network	Technical Publications	Descriptor	(does not apply)	Effective Date	Document #	Suffix
	Outages	Wire Center, Descriptor Outside Plant, Descriptor Call Center, Descriptor				

Web and Notice Subject Line	Web and Notice Subject Line	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only	Subject Line Only
Category	**Sub-Category 1**	**Sub-Category 2**	**Sub-Category 3**	**Effective Date**	**Document Number**	**Suffix** (I=initial, Rn=Revision #)
Web Site	Web Site	Descriptor	(does not apply)	Effective Date	Document #	Suffix
CMP	CMP Process Distribution List Meeting Agenda and Material Re-design/Enhancement	Descriptor	(does not apply)	Effective Date	Document #	Suffix
Tariff	Descriptor	(does not apply)	(does not apply)	Effective Date	Document #	Suffix

Note 1: "Issue Date" of notice will be in the body.

Note 2: The naming convention above does not apply to CRs. CRs will continue to show CR # and Descriptor.

Qwest Wholesale Customer Notification Letters To Go On-Line

On-Line Customer Letters Archive

Location- http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/notices/ (to be determined) .html

- All archived Customer Notification Letters will reside on the qwest.com/wholesale external web site.
- Each customer "notice" will be categorized by subject matter and grouped in an easily accessible downloadable format. Letters will be given an individual identification number based on the category, date, status, tracking number and topic abbreviation.

Category	Key
General	GENL
Product Information	PROD
Technical Publications	TPUB
Systems	SYST
Training	TRNG
Network	NETW
Tariffs	TRFF
Web Site	WEBS

Status	Key
Initial	I
Final	F

Addressable Architecture

Key.Month.Date.Year.Status.Tracking Number.Topic Abbreviation

Examples:

A product announcement would look like this:

PROD.06.21.01.F.00032.UNEUpdate

A systems announcement would look like this:

SYST.07.05.01.I.00021.IMA8

indicating an initial release notification

SYST.07.15.01.F.00021.IMA8

indicating a final release notification

SAMPLE REPORT

ID	CR #	Title	Submitter	Current Status	Owner	Org.	Director	CR PM	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
3	5263569	Loop reclamation	Lynne Powers Eschelon	12/06/00 -Reviewed under consideration	Russ Urevig	Wholesale Process	Susan Bliss	Matt Rossi 303 896-5432 mrossi@qwest.com	Ordering	Centrex, Resale, Unbundled Loop, UNE-P

Description of Change

Perform loop reclamation for CLECs and provide prior notice of Qwest's loop reclamation. Qwest has indicated that it will not perform loop reclamation to prevent a CLEC order from going into held status. In constrast, when Qwest "winsback" a customer from a CLEC, Qwest will perform loop reclamation and will do so without prior notice to the CLEC. For example, as shown in the example below, when Eschelon has placed a disconnect order on a UNE loop, Eschelon has received a rejection notice from Qwest indicating that Qwest has already disconnected the loop as a result of loop reclamation. Qwest disconnected the loop without prior notice to Eschelon. Because of this practice, an order will be processed (and not go into held status) for a Qwest retail customer, whereas a CLEC order would go into held status. The CLEC end-user customer would experience a delay (and possibly additional costs and service disruption), whereas the Qwest end-user would not. Please modify Qwest's processes to perform loop reclamation for CLECs and provide prior notice of Qwest's loop reclamation.

Status History

12/01/00Submitted
12/01/00 New - to be validated
12/04/00 Status changed to New – To be reviewed
12/06/00 Status changed to Reviewed – Under Consideration 12/06/00 - Will Discuss during UNE-P discussion marked as agenda item for 12/20 Product/Process CICMP Meeting
12/15/00 – CR still under investigation but will address at the 12/20 CICMP Meeting (SB)
1/10/01 – Will be addressed during the 1/11 – 1/12 CLEC to CLEC UNE-P meeting and results discussed in the January CICMP Meeting (RU)
2/14/01 - Product Announcement for a formalized process to enable CLEC Unbundled loop to CLEC resale communicated to CICMP team via email and posted on CICMP web site. (RN # 5393543). (RU – MR)
2/21/01 – Closing CR is dependent on requested revision to RN 5393543 – CLEC Unbundled Loop to CLEC Resale
3/19/01 – RN Revision complete and undergoing internal approval. Date of release pending approval. (BD)

3/27/01 – Revision to RN #5393543 - CLEC Unbundled Loop to CLEC Resale - Revision A as well as RN #5467108 - CLEC LNP with Unbundled Loop to CLEC Resale - Revision A released to the CICMP Team. (MR-BD)
4/16/01 – Additional revision needed to CLEC Unbundled Loop – CLEC Unbundled Loop and CLEC Unbundled Loop – Resale release notifications previously released to incorporate new policy on obtaining Circuit ID from OLSP (MR)
4/30/01 – Revision "B" to RN #5393537, RN #5393543, and RN #5467108 sent to CICMP team incorporating new procedure for obtaining Circuit ID's. (MR)
5/18/01 – CICMP team requests verification of implemented process to close CR (MR)
6/20/01 – Process implementation for enhanced Circuit ID Process to be verified and presented in interim meeting to be scheduled by Qwest prior to the July CICMP Meeting. (MR)
7/10/01 – Interim conference call conducted to discuss CLEC to CLEC conversions – meeting minutes sent to the CICMP team on 7/12/01 (MR)

SAMPLE REPORT

Proposed CMP Process Report - Open CR log and Qwest

Qwest Response

Wholesale Product Marketing

August 13, 2001

Lynne Powers
Vice President, Customer Operations
Eschelon Telecom, Inc

CC: Russ Urevig
Joan Smith
Cindy Buckmaster
Matthew Rossi

This letter is in response to your CLEC Change Request Form #5263569 dated December 1, 2001.

? Change Request: Perform loops reclamation for CLECs and provide prior notice of Qwest's loop reclamation. Qwest has indicated that it will not perform loop reclamation to prevent a CLEC order from going into held status. In contrast, when Qwest "wins back" a customer from a CLEC, Qwest will perform loop reclamation and will do so without prior notice to the CLEC. For example, as shown in the example below, when Eschelon has placed a disconnect order on a UNE loop, Eschelon has received a rejection notice from Qwest indicating that Qwest has already disconnected the loop as a result of loop reclamation. Qwest disconnected the loop without prior notice to Eschelon. Because of this practice, an order will be processed (and not go into held status) for a Qwest retail customer, whereas a CLEC order would go into held status. The CLEC end-user customer would experience a delay (and possibly additional costs and service disruption), whereas the Qwest end-user would not. Please modify Qwest's processes to perform loop reclamation for CLECs and provide prior notice of Qwest's loop reclamation.

? Qwest Response:
? As documented in the Qwest Winback process, "Loop Reclamation" is to be noted in the remark section of the LSR by Qwest Retail when migrating customers from a CLEC to Qwest Retail.
? To ensure process compliance, a plan is currently under development by Qwest Wholesale and Retail Process departments.

Sincerely,

Nancy J. Hoag
Wholesale Product Team

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

PROPOSAL—revised DRAFT on 8/14/2001

Procedures for Voting and the Impasse Resolution Process

Introduction

During the CLEC-Qwest working sessions to negotiate improvements to Qwest's Change Management Process ("CMP"), collaborative discussions will be held to achieve agreement on the process. Qwest and the CLEC participants will negotiate in good faith and will meet the goal of modifying Qwest's current Change Management Process. Participants at a working session will determine if there are any issues requiring a vote at the next working session. If there is an issue requiring a vote, the agenda for the next working session will reflect the item. In addition, the agenda will be distributed to the CLECs and posted on the CICMP Re-design web site a week in advance of the session. A CLEC may authorize another CLEC or a 3rd Party Software Provider through a Letter of Authorization ("LOA") to represent its position on a specific issue at a specific working session. (A generic LOA is posted on the CICMP Re-design web site.)

The Guiding Principles for the working session states that there is

> *One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules in the CLEC community and one vote for Qwest, making every effort to reach consensus.*

CLEC Participants To Achieve A Single Position On An Issue

- CLEC Participants will make every effort to reach consensus of an issue
- If there is a dead-lock within the CLEC participants:
  - A sidebar collaborative discussion will be held among CLECs to achieve a single position (Qwest is not present)—During the sidebar meeting, a CLEC may invoke a 'vote' among the CLEC participants to allow each participant to record his/her Company's position. At the same time, a CLEC participant may wish to abstain from placing a vote. (Refer to section on Voting Tally Form.)
  - If there is a dead-lock, the CLEC participants will bring the scenarios back to the working session with Qwest to further discuss, or request to table.
  - CLEC-Qwest will collectively agree to table the decision until the next scheduled working session ('freeze period') to allow CLEC participants to hold collaborative discussions off-line to achieve one position.
  - If there is an impasse after the 'freeze period,' the CLEC participants will exercise the Impasse Resolution Process (CLEC-CLEC Impasse). *(NOTE: AT&T is leading an effort with the CLEC participants to develop a CLEC-CLEC Impasse Resolution Process by the September 5 re-design working session.)*

CLEC-Qwest To Achieve A Single Position On An Issue

- CLEC participants and Qwest will make every attempt to reach consensus on an issue
- If there is a dead-lock between the CLEC community and Qwest:
  - A collaborative discussion will be held to achieve consensus on one position
  - If still in a dead-lock, the issue will be tabled until the next scheduled working session to allow each party to work the issue off-line
  - If the CLEC community and Qwest are still in a dead-lock at the subsequent working session after another round of discussions, the Impasse Resolution Process will be invoked. (Refer to section on CLEC-Qwest Impasse Resolution Process)

Impasse Resolution Process

- CLEC-CLEC Impasse Process
  - (to be determined by September 5—lead: AT&T)
- CLEC-Qwest Impasse Process
  - CLEC and Qwest will table (second round of tabling) until the next scheduled working session to work with stakeholders and respective leadership team to achieve one position for the impasse issue
  - Another round of collaborative discussions will continue at the third subsequent working session to close on the issue
  - If still in a dead-lock, the CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Dispute Resolution Process will be executed.

CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Dispute Resolution Process

The CLEC participants and Qwest CMP representatives will make every attempt to resolve the issue through collaborative discussions and using the Impasse Resolution Process. However, if the result of the Impasse Resolution Process remains in a dead-lock, the CLEC participants and Qwest must agree that the issue is in an impasse. Upon this agreement between CLEC and Qwest participants, there are two options to resolve this specific issue. And they are:

- **Regulator**: If agreed upon by the CLEC participants (no LOA designees) <u>and</u> Qwest representative, CLEC participants (no LOA designees) and/or Qwest representatives may approach a Regulator with the impasse issue. All parties must agree to the terms and process for resolution by a Regulator.
- **3rd Party**: If agreed upon by the CLEC participants (no LOA designee) <u>and</u> Qwest, a third party may be hired to resolve the specific issue. All parties must agree to the terms and process for resolution by a 3rd Party, including the handling of fees.

Attachment—Voting Tally Form

Voting Tally Form

The Voting Tally Form serves as a collective record of the individual vote on a specific issue. The results of the tally may be submitted with the working session meeting minutes as an attached document. However, each CLEC or authorized LOA representative who voted may decline to publish its voting result.

The form will include the following information:

- *CMP Re-design Working Session*: The date of the working session that caused this 'vote' to occur
- *Date of Vote*: The date of occurrence
- *Issue*: The issue that is causing the vote
- *Scenario*: State each scenario/position for a vote. Each scenario will be labeled A, B, C, etc.
- *CLEC Company*: A CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Core Team member's or a participant's company name
- *Core Team Member*: Write the name of the member that will participate in a 'vote.' If CLEC Company Core Team member is absent and no LOA has been executed, write ABSENT. The Core Team member is responsible to inform Qwest if there are any changes to CLEC representation.
- *Participating CLEC*: Write the name of the participant (non-Core Team member) <u>and</u> Company that will participate in a 'vote.'
- *LOA To*: Name of authorized representative that will participate in a 'vote.' A LOA must be presented to the Core Team members and given to Judy Schultz-Qwest to retain in file.
- *OK to Share Result (yes or no):* The CLEC or authorized LOA representative must write 'yes' or 'no' in this box to allow or deny permission for Qwest to publish the result of his/her vote in the working session meeting minutes.
- *A, B, C, D*: Vote for a scenario by placing a 'X' in the appropriate box.
- *Abstain*: Any participant may abstain to place a vote by placing an "X" in the box
- *CLEC Consensus*: A designated CLEC will insert the consensus position. The designated CLEC will also articulate to the working session audience the CLEC position so there is only one statement of the unified CLEC position.
- *Qwest's Position*: Qwest will insert Qwest's position on the specific issue.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

PROPOSAL

Voting Tally Form

CMP Re-design Working Session:	
Date of Vote:	

Issue:	
Scenario A:	
Scenario B:	
Scenario C:	
Scenario D:	

CLEC Company	Core Team Member	LOA[1] To:	OK[2] to Share Result (yes/no)	Vote				
				A	B	C	D	
Allegiance Telecom								
AT&T								
Avista								
Covad Communications								
Electric Light Wave								
Eschelon Telecom								
Integra Telecom								
McLeod USA								
SBC Telecom								
Scindo Networks								
Sprint								
WorldCom								

[1] CLEC has a Letter of Authorization in file that entitles another CLEC or 3rd Party Software Provider to vote on its behalf. The LOA is given to Judy Schultz/Qwest to retain in file.

[2] Each voter must indicate by writing a 'Yes' or 'No' if permission is given or denied to publish his/her Company's voting result.

Voting Tally Form—continued

CMP Re-design Working Session:	
Date of Vote:	

Participating CLEC

CLEC Company	Core Team Member	LOA To:	OK to Share Result (yes/no)	Vote				
				A	B	C	D	

CLEC Consensus:	
Qwest's Position:	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

Core Team

(revised—August 14, 2001)

Expectations/ Responsibilities

- Dedicated resource to negotiate a new CMP process.
- Core Team Members can be added at any time understanding the roles and responsibilities of a Core Team Member.
- Core Team Members must commit to participate either in person, via conference call, or by LOA in each working session.
- Core Team Membership will be revoked if 3 consecutive working sessions are missed.
- New Core Team member will not be allowed to re-open a vote that has been decided on any issue.

Attachment 9

1875 Lawrence Street
Denver, CO 80202

To: CICMP Redesign Team

From: AT&T Redesign Members

Date: August 13, 2001

Re: Comments Concerning the August 7th and August 8th Meetings

AT&T submits this memo regarding our major concerns arising from last week's CICMP redesign meetings. There are essentially five areas of concern that we would like to discuss at our next meeting; they include: (i) clarifying and documenting voting requirements; (ii) defining the scope of the change management process for OSS and product or policy changes; (iii) clarifying KPMG's role in the redesign process as well as meetings; (iv) discussing Category 3 Exception changes; and (v) using CICMP as a mechanism for Qwest to demand amendments to interconnection agreements. What follows is a synopsis of our questions in regard to each of these five topics.

I) VOTING - What are the precise rules for voting? If there are voting rules, where are they documented, and shouldn't Qwest distribute these documents to the group? We have not discussed, in any of our meetings, what happens when there is a dead-lock in the vote as between the combined CLEC vote and the Qwest vote or for votes taken between the CLECs. What are the escalation procedures in the case of deadlocks? So that we can avoid any future uncertainty, AT&T requests that Qwest and the CICMP participants discuss these questions and create documentation that clearly describes voting rights and obligations along with the resolutions to these and any other questions that arise.

II) SCOPE- We have not seen Qwest's proposal on the "scope" of this redesign effort. As we continue to meet, it becomes clear that the scope or a purpose statement is critical to the work in which we embarking. Without this, it does not appear that we have a clear sense of direction as we move forward in creating the change management process.

III) KPMG - We would like clarification on KPMG's role in the redesign meetings. We are unclear why KPMG is present. While we appreciate

Sam's assistance with the naming convention proposal in one of last week's discussions, in fairness, KPMG's role should be at most to observe, and primarily to evaluate Qwest's redesigned end-product as opposed to creating or influencing the end-result.

IV) CATEGORY 3 Exception Changes – Our notes reflect that Qwest would like to discuss category 3 out of order. This category deals with product, process and technical changes. We believe that it is inappropriate and premature to talk about exception changes at this point in our discussion. In particular, it is wholly inappropriate to take-up category 3 while skipping categories 1 and 2.

Because Qwest chose to discuss the CICMP process in so far as it relates to OSS first, our efforts should concentrate on completing OSS first before we jump to other topics, and in no event should we skip around in another topic.

V) AT&T notes that when Qwest submits a Release Notification, particularly in the context of product, process and technical changes, many such notifications appear to unilaterally demand that the CLECs must adopt such changes by a date certain regardless of what their respective interconnection agreements state. AT&T believes this approach is contrary to our contract rights, and we request that the CICMP group discuss this process either now or in relation to future discussion regarding product, process and technical changes in the CICMP redesign process.

Qwest Help Desk Severity Level Definition

What Is a Severity Level?

Severity level is a means of assessing and documenting the impact of the loss of functionality to the customer and the impact to the business. The severity level gives restoration or repair priority to problems causing the greatest impact to the customer or business.

Outage and Severity-Level Definitions,

How to Determine the Severity-Level

To determine the appropriate severity level, review the following descriptions for all four severity levels and then choose the one that **most accurately** reflects the true impact of the problem reported. Accurately assessing severity levels facilitates resolving critical problems first.

All PMRs will contain documentation that validates the severity level assigned.

Severity 1: Critical Impact

Descriptors

- Critical.
- High visibility.
- Large number of orders or customers — internal or external — are affected.
- Affects online commitment.
- Production or cycle stopped — priority batch commitment missed.
- Major impact on revenue.
- Major component not available for use.
- Many and/or major files lost.
- Major loss of functionality.
- Problem cannot be bypassed.
- No viable or productive workaround available.

Examples

- Major network backbone outage without redundancy.
- End-of-month journals cannot be processed.
- Environmental problems causing multiple system failures.
- Large number of service and other work order commitments missed.
- Inability to test customer lines to a large number of Central Offices.

- Large number of customer calls or access blocked, sent to overloaded offices: calls not distributed or cut off.

Continued on the next page

Outage and Severity-Level Definitions, continued

Severity 2: Serious Impact

Descriptors

- Serious.
- Moderate visibility.
- Moderate to large number of customers, internal or external, or orders affected.
- Potentially affects online commitment.
- Serious slow response times.
- Serious loss of functionality.
- Potentially affects production — potential miss of priority batch commitment.
- Moderate impact on revenue.
- Limited use of product or component.
- Component continues to fail. Intermittently down for short periods, but repetitive.
- Few or small important files lost.
- Problem may have a possible bypass; the bypass must be acceptable to the client.
- Major access down, but a partial backup exists.

Examples

- Frequent intermittent logoffs.
- Service and/or other work order commitments delayed or missed.
- Customer calls answered, but customers given wrong VRU menu options or transferred to wrong office.
- Customer calls received, but no real-time call activity information available.
- Inability to print orders — affecting large number of orders, numerous technicians, large metro area.
- Inability to test customer lines to any number of central office ports.
- Test system failed — production affected.

Continued on the next page

Outage and Severity-Level Definitions, continued

Severity 3: Moderate Impact

Descriptors

- Low to medium visibility.
- Low customer, internal or external, or order impact.
- Low impact on revenue.
- Limited use of product or component.
- Single client device affected.
- Minimal loss of functionality.
- Problem may be bypassed; redundancy in place. Bypass must be acceptable to the client.
- Automated workaround in place and known. Workaround must be acceptable to the client.

Examples

- Single client cannot access real-time call activity information; other individuals can.
- Equipment taking hard errors, no impact yet.
- Historical call activity reports not available.
- Loss of printing, but data available online.
- Inability to print orders, affecting single technician and small volume of orders; orders can be faxed.
- Noisy voice lines, but low quality still usable for customers.
- Redundant peripheral equipment down.
- Few intermittent logoffs.
- Test system failed — production unaffected.

Continued on next page

Outage and Severity-Level Definitions, continued

Severity 4: Minimal Impact	Descriptors	
		• Low or no visibility. • No direct impact on customer. • Few functions impaired. • Problem can be bypassed. Bypass must be acceptable to the customer. • System resource low; no impact yet. • Preventative maintenance request.
	Examples	
		• Print, screen, keyboard quality. • Misleading, unclear system messages causing confusion for users. • Backup access to system down, primary okay. • Device or software regularly has to be reset, but continues to work.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
Revised—August 16, 2001

Attachment 11

Note: Agenda will include standing items—Review Core Team participation, Issue/Action Items, Review redlined document, Final Meeting Minutes from the previous session, and Set/Confirm agenda for the next working session

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Thursday, July 11—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Kickoff
Thursday, July 19—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Introduction • Scope • Administration—Managing the Change Management Process
Tuesday, August 7 and Wednesday, August 8—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	• Performance Measurements (informational) • Notification Process • Distribution List • Web Site • Tracking (e.g., CR and RN status definition, naming convention)
Tuesday, August 14 and Thursday, August 16—COMPLETED	1005 – 17th Street, 1st Floor, Junior Board Room Denver, CO	• Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Change)—continue on 9/5 • Prioritization—to be addressed on 9/5 • Exception Process (added by Qwest after 7/19 meeting)—to be addressed on 9/5
Wednesday, Sep 5 and Thursday, Sep 6 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Change)—continue discussion from 8/16 • Prioritization • Exception Process Escalation Process and Dispute Resolution Process
Tuesday, Sep 18 and Thursday, Sep 20 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Introduction of OSS • Retirement of OSS • Post Implementation Support • Release Requirements (e.g., Initial, Walk-through, Comment Cycle, Final, Release Testing)

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
Revised—August 16, 2001

Attachment 11

Dates/Time	Location	Element
		• Re-visit Scope • Maintenance of CMP framework
Tuesday, Oct 2 and Wednesday, Oct 3 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	(To be determined) Minneapolis, Minnesota	• Continue CMP discussion on OSS or begin Product and Process discussions
Tuesday, Oct 16 and Thursday, Oct 18 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on OSS or Product and Process
Tuesday, Oct 30 and Wednesday, Oct 31 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	(To be determined) Minneapolis, Minnesota	• Continue CMP discussion on OSS or Product and Process
Tuesday, Nov 13 and Thursday, Nov 15 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on OSS or Product and Process
Tuesday, Nov 27 and Wednesday, Nov 28 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on OSS or Product and Process
Tuesday, Dec 11 and Thursday, Dec 13 9 am to 5 pm MT Conference bridge line: 1-877-847-0304 (Passcode 7101617#)	1801 California Street 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room Denver, CO	• Continue CMP discussion on OSS or Product and Process

1232939/67817.150

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design Wednesday, September 5 and Thursday, September 6, 2001 Working Session

1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Bridgeline: 1-877-847-0304, pass code 7101617#

NOTE: These are DRAFT meeting minutes Qwest developed following the two day working session. Draft minutes will be circulated to the CMP Re-design Core Team Members in attendance with FINAL Meeting Minutes to be posted on the Wholesale CMP Re-design web site once updated with attendee revisions. *Note: All CLEC revisions are due end of business day 10-10-01, but revisions from ATT and WorldCom have been received and incorporated.*

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team (Team) and other participants met September 5th and 6th to continue with the redesign effort of the Change Management Process. Following is the write-up of the discussions, action items, and decisions made in the working session. The attachments to these meeting minutes are as follow-

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Attendance Record
- Attachment 2: September 5 – 6 Agenda
- Attachment 3: Sample—CMP Meeting Distribution Package
- Attachment 4: Customer Letter Site Design, September 5, 2001
- Attachment 5: Proposed –CMP Work Flow for OSS Interface
- Attachment 6: Proposed-CMP Work Flow for Product/Process
- Attachment 7: DRAFT—Procedures for Voting and Impasse Resolution Process for the CMP Re-design Working Sessions
- Attachment 8: Objectives of the CMP Re-design Effort
- Attachment 9: COIL 18 Points
- Attachment 10: Interim Exception Process
- Attachment 11: Issues and Action Items Log
- *Attachment 12: CMP Redesign Sep 5-6 Mtg Minutes ATT Comments 9-10-01*

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting began with introductions of the meeting attendees. Judy Lee reviewed the two day agenda and asked for input regarding any changes or modifications to the material. There was only one agenda item that was added, that being the review of arrangements and locations for the October sessions in Minneapolis.

Judy Lee began the meeting with a review of the Issues and Actions Items Log. The first item reviewed was 11C-CMP Meeting Distribution Package. Judy Schultz-Qwest reviewed the Sample Distribution Package that was provided and posted to the CMP Re-design web site. Schultz indicated that the most noted changes were on page 7 of the sample package. That page showed a mock-up of a Change Request (CR) with the details that are to be incorporated into the CR, and the processes being implemented to improve Systems and Product/Process CR tracking and resolution. This revision was based upon a request from several CLECs that a single document carry all status history and information regarding that particular CR progress and information. Schultz reviewed the role of the CR-Project Manager (CR-PM) and the activities that take place for CR assignment and clarification. A CR-PM will be assigned to each CR that is

submitted. A clarification meeting will be organized by the CR-PM to ensure that the CR that has been submitted by the CLEC is properly defined and that the scope is understood and agreed to by the originator and Qwest. Donna Osborne-Miller-ATT asked if the clarification meeting took place before the monthly meeting. Schultz explained that if the CR is received by the agreed to interval, the CR would be assigned to a CR-PM and then assigned to the proper Qwest owners. Osborne-Miller asked how quickly that happens after submission of the CR. Schultz explained that because Qwest had many outstanding CRs that had been submitted prior to this modified process, Qwest was trying to get all CRs clarified and tracked by a CR-PM. Schultz continued that in the future, new CRs would be immediately assigned a CR-PM who would schedule a clarification meeting shortly following submittal. Schultz further explained that the CR-PM would be responsible for maintaining the project plan and tracking all necessary milestones and commitments associated with that particular CR. Terry Wicks-Allegiance asked how CR clarification meetings are managed for CRs that could impact CLECs other than the CR originator. Wicks went on to explain that a CLEC may submit a CR that impacts the entire CLEC community, but that the clarification meeting would include only Qwest and the CR originating CLEC. Wicks asked when in the process other CLECs affected by that CR would become involved. Wicks asked if there should be a step allowing inclusion of CLECs impacted by a CR as they would not be involved in the first clarification call. Schultz responded that the step to include other impacted CLECs takes place at the monthly CMP meeting when CRs are reviewed with the CLEC community. Wicks stated that there should be a step that includes other CLECs prior to the monthly CMP meeting. Sandy Evans-Sprint asked if CLECs needed an appeal process for situations when Qwest decides not to pursue the CR or does not provide an acceptable answer. Wicks again asked how CLECs could get input to CRs they originated prior to the monthly CMP meeting. Judy Lee asked that CLECs determine where in the CR process Qwest should allow appeals. Karen Clauson-Eschelon stated that it was difficult to review and understand all CR details in the monthly CMP meeting given the time pressure and amount of material covered. Clauson went on further to recommend that the first meeting following the submission of the CR be a meeting educating the CLEC community on the newly submitted CRs. Clauson further recommended that CRs not be closed at the first meeting following submission, but at the second monthly CMP meeting. Clauson stated that there may be a need for ongoing discussion of the CR, and that there was pressure to close the CR at the first monthly meeting. Liz Balvin-WorldCom explained that collocation request meetings are held by Qwest within 48 hours of request submission to discuss those requests. Balvin stated that the Re-Design team needed to set time expectations for finalizing definitions of the CRs. Schultz then asked for suggestions of how to better manage CR clarification at the monthly meetings. Schultz stated the goal of the CR clarification meetings, and subsequent response review meetings, was to provide discussion in advance of the CMP monthly meetings in order to keep individual CR clarifications from taking valuable time at the monthly CMP meeting. Schultz asked if the CR clarification and response review meetings should be opened up to include more than the CR originator, and how that would be managed. Evans asked if response to CRs would be provided verbally or in writing. Osborne-Miller also asked if there was a mechanism in place to relate new CRs to CRs already being worked. Clauson stated that all CLECs could see and review CRs, but that when a response was provided, not all CLECs knew about the response. Clauson said following the monthly CMP meeting there could be a need for an additional clarification meeting with other impacted CLECs. Judy Lee noted that all CR status and progress was posted on the web, but Clauson stated that there needed to be enough discussion so that all interested CLECs understood the CR. Clauson further stated that there was not a need for general CLEC attendance at clarification meetings at this time. Larry Gindlesberger-Covad said his preference would be that other CLECs be invited to the clarification meetings, which would make CR discussion clearer at the general meeting. Schultz and Gindlesberger discussed inviting other CLECs to the clarification meetings. Balvin questioned how it would be determined which CLECs were invited to what clarification meetings. *BALVIN WORLDCOM COMMENT:. (this question is a result of how Qwest informs the CLEC community...when WCom receives notifications, WCom recipients are all that are listed, the question then became "what mechanism is in place for Qwest to validate that the entire CLEC community has been notified?"* Wicks agreed with Gindlesberger that other CLECs should be involved in the clarification steps and that being on the call would help create understanding of the CR prior to the monthly CMP meeting. Clauson agreed with

Wicks and Gindlesberger but stated that the practical reality of being involved in so many meetings would be extremely difficult. She stated that Kathy Stichter-Eschelon had spent three to four days the previous week on CR clarification and that CR activity plus release notification activity would really tie up Eschelon resources. Clauson further stated that improvements to the CR process have been made, but that if it became too structured it would be unrealistic for all CLECs to participate on all scheduled clarification and response calls. Clauson went on to say that the monthly CMP meetings were needed to review CRs, and that it might be possible to schedule a one day conference call to review all CR responses. Gindlesberger and Wicks agreed with Clauson on the potential for an additional review session outside the monthly CMP meeting. Clauson then asked the Re-Design team members if there were other solutions to be considered. Schultz then asked the attendees to recap how the process might best be managed, to address the concerns of CLEC involvement in CRs, and to clarify whether a separate meeting should be held to discuss CR. Gindlesberger recommended that clarification meetings include other CLECs besides the originator, but it was determined that there would be too many meetings and the clarification calls could be delayed. Wicks suggested that the clarification call include only the originating CLEC, and that a means to involve the CLECS in the response review meeting be developed. Following discussion, and a recap of the proposed solutions, it was agreed by the attendees that:

(A) The clarification call would involve only the CLEC originating the CR,
(B) All CLECs would be invited to the response and review meeting/call, and
(C) Qwest would provide all CLECs the response at the monthly CMP meeting and, if requested, another call would be scheduled to review the CR with CLECs.

Schultz then asked if the Sample Distribution Package that included the CR example met the needs of the CLECs. Clauson wanted to make certain that all documentation associated with a CR was included in the CR document, and Schultz stated it was. Mike Hydock-ATT asked how the Distribution Package would be searchable once it was posted on the web. Schultz stated that it would be searchable by title and description in a word document format. At that point the attendees agreed that the Distribution Package would meet their needs.

Discussion then moved to an overview of the web site drafted by Jarby Blackmun-Qwest. Blackmun provided a handout that was posted on the web titled "Customer Letter Site Design, September 5, 2001". Blackmun reviewed the material and explained that in the future e-mail notifications will follow the recommended naming conventions, and that the e-mails can carry the naming convention and description in the subject line. Evans-Sprint asked if there was any time when the document numbers would be referred to, and Blackmun responded that the notification revisions would carry the same subject line as the original notification. Clauson-Eschelon requested that if a revision is sent that the original document name and date is captured in the subject line. Blackmun stated that when a notification is sent it is not known that a revision may be required. Schultz-Qwest stated that agreement was made in the August 14 and 16 session to provide notifications that included the term "Initial" for first notifications, and R1, R2, etc., for each revision to that notification. Blackmun stated that these revision descriptors could begin to be implemented, but that the onus was on the originator to make certain they designated when the notice was initial versus a revision to an existing notice. Clauson asked how the revision identification would be done. Schultz stated that one of the roles in Change Management was a communications project manager, and that person had responsibility for internal training and communications of requirements agreed to in CMP. Blackmun explained that eventually all notices will be distributed through the mailout tool. Clauson asked whom the CLECs should contact at Qwest if they have questions regarding a notification. Blackmun replied that the Qwest service managers assigned to the CLEC are the points of contact for questions and clarifications. Clauson stated that they would prefer contacting the Subject Matter Expert (SME) associated with the notification, rather than the Service Manager. Blackmun continued the review of the structure of the web site, and Wicks-Allegiance asked if there would be a search engine associated with the website. Blackmun replied that Qwest can explore a search engine capability, and that the search engine could be configured to explore on major categories such as effective date, category, notice type, and subject. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest could look at search engine capabilities, and said that Blackmun would submit a proposal On September 20. Blackmun stated that the naming conventions discussed in the Re-design meeting would be effective for

notices sent out beginning this week. Wicks-Allegiance asked if the notifications could be accessed within any of the column headers. Blackmun responded that documents could be accessed using any of the columns, i.e., Effective Date, Document Number, or Topic (See page 5, handout titled "Customer Letter Site Design, September 5, 2001".) Balvin-WorldCom asked whether the web site would still contain archived documents. Blackmun stated that there is still an Archive location on the Qwest Wholesale CMP website. The team then broke for lunch.

Schultz-Qwest began the afternoon with a review of flow charts titled "Proposed –CMP Work Flow for OSS Interface with CLEC" and "Proposed-CMP Work Flow for Product/Process". Schultz explained that the target timeframes were not in the documents, but they would be developed and submitted. Schultz went on to explain that for Product/Process there was a new step titled "CLEC Test and Acceptance Phase". She stated that this new step would allow the CLEC to confirm that the Product/Process solution worked, and that any CLEC could be involved in this step. Schultz also stated that Qwest would change the statuses that are in place today to the new statuses based on the Proposed Work Flows once the Re-Design team had approved the changed steps. The new statuses for OSS Interface could be Submitted, Presented, Prioritized, Implemented, CLEC Tested, and Completed. The new statuses for Product/Process could be Submitted, Clarified/Evaluated, Presented, Implemented, CLEC Tested, and Completed. Schultz then pointed out that the OSS Interface Work Flow included prioritization. Schultz also stated that the amount of clarification required for an OSS Interface CR was usually less than the clarification required for a Product/Process CR. Clauson-Eschelon and Evans-Sprint both stated that on the OSS Interface Work Flow it indicated that if a CR Dispute were not resolved, the CR would be closed. Clauson and Evans both stated that the CR should remain open unless the originator closed the CR. Clauson and Evans also questioned the step of the OSS Interface Work Flow that indicated that CRs that are not prioritized within 12 months would be closed. Again, Clauson and Evans both stated that the CR should remain open unless the originator closed the CR. Becky Quintana-Colorado PUC asked if there was, or would be, clarification on the Dispute Resolution process since it could impact regulatory agencies. Clauson asked if there needed to be an additional status for escalation and dispute resolution. Wicks-Allegiance requested that if a CR was cancelled and reissued, there be a status showing that it was reissued and that the reissued CR capture the dates and milestones of the old CR that Qwest was not originally capable of completing. Judy Lee recommended that there might be a deferred status rather than a closed status for CRs so that they can be revisited at a later date. Schultz-Qwest asked if a deferred CR would be automatically reopened, and by whom. Lee suggested that the deferred status for a CR be established for a set period of time specified by the originator. Schultz then asked if the other statuses to be included should be "Deferred, Escalated, and Withdrawn". Wicks recommended that the new statuses be Deferred and Withdrawn. Clauson requested that there also be a "Denied" status for those CRs that Qwest stated could not be pursued. Schultz then recommended that the statuses be developed to include "Deferred, Escalated, Withdrawn, and Denied". Quintana asked that the CMP escalation process being developed include the definitions from the steps that are developed for escalation in the Work Flows. Wicks asked why a CR would be kept in Denied status. Clauson stated that this was a way of keeping a CR open, even though Qwest had denied it. Schultz then asked if there was anything more on the two flow charts, and requested that CMP team members would continue to make and incorporate improvements so that CRs could be tracked most efficiently and effectively. Schultz asked if she could roll-out the modified process (i.e., flow chart) to the CLEC community at the next monthly CMP meeting. The team agreed that Schultz should communicate the modifications as flow-charted with revisions as discussed by the CLEC community at the September 19 meeting.

Discussion then moved to the CMP monthly meeting. Gindlesberger-Covad expressed concern at the number of Qwest attendees at the meetings, and Judy Lee asked if those attendees prevented the meeting from being effective. Gindlesberger stated that there were too many side meetings going on and it was distracting. Schultz-Qwest stated that she had asked the Qwest Directors and Subject Matter Experts to attend the meeting due to the complexity of the issues, and so that Qwest could hear first hand the discussion around particular items and issues. Schultz stated that she was concerned about the CLEC attendance at the monthly CMP meetings

and asked how the meetings could be structured to improve attendance. Gindlesberger stated that, unfortunately, there were not that many CLECs left. Clauson-Eschelon stated that originally CICMP (CMP) was viewed as a technical forum, and that Qwest should have its sales personnel contact the appointed CLECs to let them know that the CMP covered more than just systems. Evans-Sprint stated that BellSouth had forums to explain their Change Management Processes, and that attendance grew as a result of those forums. Clauson then stated that Qwest should socialize the results of CMP as well as explain it. Gindlesberger stated that SBC gets RSVPs for meetings, and that they had cancelled one forum due to lack of responses only to reschedule it after the cancellation notice was sent out and CLECs indicated interest in having the forum. Tom Dixon-WorldCom stated that CMP Re-Design and Monthly meetings were being held in addition to 271 workshops, and that attendance at CMP meetings was difficult because of all the conflicts with other Qwest scheduled meetings. Dixon then stated that he was at this Re-Design meeting because Qwest had pulled CMP from the 271 workshops, and had referred all CMP activities to the Re-Design effort. Dixon also stated it was obvious that Qwest had many more resources to cover all the meetings, and that CLECs were at a disadvantage due to resource limitations. Clauson stated that she still wanted to work CMP Re-Design based on the meeting schedule, and that Eschelon wanted changes to CMP, but that Qwest had originally begun the Re-Design effort with a more aggressive schedule of meetings and action items. Dixon also stated that the States set 271 workshop schedules, and do not consider what other related meetings and workshops may be scheduled. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated she had missed CMP Re-Design meetings due to conflicts with Colorado 271 workshops. Dixon stated that Qwest had made a corporate decision to take CMP out of the 271 workshops, and that he was at the Re-Design meeting to observe. Terry Bahner-ATT stated that she was an operations representative from ATT, that she did not participate in 271 workshops, and that she understood the Re-Design team to be operationally focused. Clauson stated it was too bad that CMP had been pulled from the 271 workshops and that there needed to be a linkage of information from the workshops into the CMP teams. Dixon then stated that in the workshops he had raised several issues two months ago including escalation and dispute resolution, and was told that the Re-Design was also working these issues. Dixon stated there was a limit to the number of resources WorldCom could provide to work through CMP issues. Quintana then asked who was bringing everything together related to CMP that would be submitted to the Colorado PUC. Clauson then asked how the CMP work being done by Re-Design was going to be reviewed by regulatory bodies. Clauson further stated she felt Re-Design might be a farce, and asked what Qwest planned to file. Schultz stated that CMP changes were being developed and defined by the Re-Design team. Dixon stated that the Re-Design team was now the location for resolution of all issues, not just operational issues because Qwest had made a corporate decision to move CMP out of the workshops and into the Re-Design team. Gindlesberger stated that the CMP Re-Design had achieved in two months what BellSouth had taken 6 months to accomplish. He noted that there had been drastic improvements implemented by the team. Clauson stated that Schultz did not have the staff to manage all CMP requirements, and that attention to CMP would be dropped after 271. Clauson stated she questioned Qwest's ongoing commitment to CMP, and had thought that the results from the Re-Design team would be brought back into a 271 workshop for review. Gindlesberger stated he did testify on CMP Re-Design at an Arizona 271 workshop. Dixon stated that Arizona and Washington Commissions wanted to review what Qwest filed in Colorado, and it was naïve for Re-Design team members to think that Re-Design efforts were going to be reviewed in 271 workshops. Schultz explained that process improvements that have been approved at Re-Design and reviewed at CMP Monthly meetings have been implemented quickly. Quintana stated that Mark Routh had answered very specific questions at the Colorado 271 workshops, but that many items had not been addressed or resolved by the Re-Design team. Quintana questioned how the remaining work was to be incorporated into the 271 workshops and the SGATs. She stated it is difficult for the Commission to recommend compliance when many CMP issues and processes have yet to be reviewed and implemented. Schultz stated that we need to continue to move forward and that progress has been made.

Following a short break, the Re-Design team reconvened and Osborne-Miller-ATT stated that the impasse voting being discussed was only for Re-Design and wondered how voting for impasse would be managed within monthly CMP meetings. Osborne-Miller stated that ATT was

responsible for bringing a CLEC to CLEC impasse voting process to the Re-Design team, but that it was not anticipated that there would be any CLEC to CLEC impasse issues within the Re-design effort. Clauson-Eschelon asked how the CLEC to CLEC impasse resolution should be worded. Osborne-Miller stated that if an impasse issue was raised, the CLEC Re-Design team members would take the issues back to their respective companies, and then the CLECs would schedule a conference call with the goal being to resolve the dispute. Judy Lee asked that the CLEC community designate a CLEC spokesperson to provide updates at the monthly CMP meetings for CLEC to CLEC impasse issues. Hydock-ATT stated that any CLEC to CLEC impasse issue would be tabled at the Re-Design meeting until the CLEC community reached a compromise. Osborne-Miller asked if the Re-Design team was comfortable with this process and there were no objections. Quintana-Colorado PUC asked what jurisdiction a state commission has to Re-Design since CMP applied to all 14 states Qwest operates in, but a commission ruling is state specific. Clauson stated that any party could go to a commission or regulatory body at any time during CMP. Quintana stated that the language can only be binding in the particular state. Osborne-Miller asked if regulatory issues had to be brought before all 14 states. Gindlesberger-Covad stated that SBC had implemented some processes only in Texas based on Texas Commission requirements. Quintana pointed out that the Re-Design team covered requirements across the Qwest region of fourteen states. Clauson pointed out that all processes and operations changes developed by the Re-Design team were to become part of the SGAT. Dixon-WorldCom stated that Re-Design was now more than an operational team, and that Legal-Regulatory issues needed to be addressed by the Re-Design effort. Clauson again stated that she had thought the Re-Design effort was to come under further Review, and it would be part of the SGAT. Dixon asked if the Re-Design team would manage an impasse list, and whether there were mechanisms to file this list with the commissions. Quintana stated there were no processes to file impasse issue associated with CMP. Schultz stated that the Re-Design team was moving away from the Guiding Principles that were developed by the Re-Design team by including legal/regulatory issues and legal representation on the Re-Design team. Dixon-WorldCom stated the shift of the Re-Design team to include legal/regulatory issues was a result of Qwest's removing CMP from the workshops, and Qwest stating that all issues should be brought to the Re-Design team. Quintana agreed that the Re-Design team was addressing issues such as escalation and dispute resolution that would drive the need to have public policy and legal involvement. Clauson stated that she had always been under the impression that the operational aspects recommended by the Re-Design team would come under regulatory review for compliance, and that the guidelines were developed under the belief that the Re-Design team was an operations team. Clauson stated that Qwest had superior knowledge as to how the outputs of the Re-Design team were being used and the Re-Design team was not informed of the information. Clauson stated that she was going forward with the Re-Design effort under a misconception of the team's role. Clauson further stated that she thought impasse processes developed by the Re-Design team would become part of the 271 proceedings, and that it was ridiculous to think that the team could separate out legal issues. Clauson explained that the intent of the Guiding Principles was not to exclude legal/regulatory issues, but to focus on operational issues. Clauson stated she never interpreted the "Guiding Principles" to mean that a CLEC could not their respective legal/regulatory representative. Clauson also stated that she was concerned that the Re-Design team had originally planned to deal with legal/regulatory issues and that it was important to include legal/regulatory inputs to avoid initiating processes that were not in support of or in conflict with legal/regulatory positions of Re-Design team participants. Quintana stated that because Qwest was closing CMP at the workshops, Re-Design meetings would have to involve legal/regulatory representatives and that the Colorado Commission was particularly interested in items such as escalation and dispute resolution that could impact the commissions. Sharon Van Meter-ATT stated that ATT is communicating outputs from Re-Design sessions to their attorneys, but agreed that the Re-Design should be operationally focused. Quintana stated that hopefully legal/regulatory representation would help, and not impede, the Re-Design process. Hydock-ATT stated that there were 18 issues from the 271 workshops that needed to be addressed by the Re-Design team. Clauson stated that with the shift of focus of legal issues into the Re-Design team that the original guiding principles were not in alignment, and that each team member's interpretation would differ based on their understanding of the Re-Design effort. Schultz explained that she did not know of the movement of CMP out of the 271

workshops. Clauson stated that she understood that Schultz might not know Qwest regulatory shifts, but that these were Qwest positions that needed to be understood. Quintana stated that there were to be no more workshops based on a request from Qwest. Dixon stated that he didn't believe that Qwest was intentionally trying to mislead the Re-Design team, but that there were legal/regulatory positions that were affecting the Re-Design team which needed to be understood. Clauson stated that it looked like Qwest had changed its position and that the Re-Design team needed to understand that change. Wicks-Allegiance asked what the 18 points were that Hydock-ATT referred to. Quintana agreed to distribute those 18 points to the Re-Design team. Clauson asked how the Re-Design team was going to frame the legal/regulatory issues. Would that be state by state? Quintana stated that the members of the Re-Design team could recommend language that stated that a decision from the first regulatory body would hold precedence and govern resolution of impasse issues. Quintana stated that Qwest was one of the first ILECS to work CMP from a regional multi-state perspective. Quintana then asked if there are any ILECs managing state by state requirements. Gindlesberger stated that SBC manages different state requirements where they operate. He stated that in Texas SBC must file all Tech Pubs with the Texas commission, and that this is altogether different from how things are handled in SNET. Clauson stated that the Re-Design team could have an operational focus, but that legal/regulatory representation sho7uld also be an option. Judy Lee asked if that means legal representation is allowed at the Re-Design meetings. Evans-Sprint stated that adding legal/regulatory discussions would lengthen the Re-Design process. Gindlesberger stated he would not need to be part of legal/regulatory matters. Dixon stated that although he was an attorney for WorldCom he had not raised any legal issues for discussion at this session. Dixon stated that he was just providing information on legal/regulatory issues that affected this team, and that the Re-Design team should be aware of. Dixon went on to say that he had no intention of attending Re-Design meetings, but had been referred by Qwest to the Re-Design team for CMP issues. Quintana agreed that the Re-Design effort was intended to be an operations effort, but that legal/regulatory issues had been deferred to this team by Qwest in the workshops. Mark Routh-Qwest agreed that the 18 points referred to earlier had been deferred to the Re-Design team. Quintana stated that for the most part, the 18 points were being addressed in the Re-Design effort. Quintana stated that since issues had been deferred from the workshops into the Re-Design team, regulatory bodies should be represented. Clauson stated that legal/regulatory participation was welcome at the Re-Design sessions, and that she believed from the beginning that the "Guiding Principles" did not preclude legal/regulatory participation. Clauson stated that this representation was necessary to keep the team from suffering delays in pursuing something operationally that was reversed due to legal/regulatory conflicts. Judy Lee asked if the team wanted to determine what items were legal versus operational. Schultz stated that the team could potentially allot certain time for legal/regulatory issues, but that she was concerned progress would slow down. Gindlesberger also expressed concern that legal/regulatory issues would slow the CMP Re-Design. Clauson questioned if there is progress when members of the team have such different understanding of the responsibility and what is to be accomplished. Wicks stated that the Re-Design had started out with an operations focus, but that the focus had changed based on the ending of 271 workshops. Several team members expressed concern that they did not have the knowledge or expertise to know what were legal/regulatory issues, and what weren't. Clauson stated that since Qwest had deferred legal/regulatory issues to the Re-Design team at an August Colorado Commission 271 workshop, attorneys should be in attendance if required. It was agreed to by all Re-Design attendees that they had the option to bring legal/regulatory representatives to the Re-Design sessions, but that the focus was to remain operational.

Judy Lee then began review of the Issues/Actions Items Log dated August 21, 2001. Attachment 10. Discussion regarding Action items follows.

13D. Clauson-Eschelon asked if all documentation would be posted to the CR document. Bahner-ATT asked if e-mails pertaining to CRs will be posted in the CR document and if the CR-Project Manager (CR-PM) is responsible for all updates to the CR. Routh-Qwest stated the CR documentation would capture all correspondence.

38. There was lengthy discussion regarding the roles of the Qwest sales and service managers. Clauson stated she had problems tying up Eschelon's service manager with clarification items because the service manager is usually dealing with service affecting issues. LeiLani Hines-WorldCom agreed that the roles are not clearly defined. There were several comments by Re-Design CLEC attendees that the service managers are not aware or trained on notifications sent to the CLECS and that it was difficult getting accurate and timely responses to CLEC questions. Schultz stated that the service manager should be the point of contact, and that she would bring the Qwest Director-Service Management in to address CLEC concerns.

42. Jim Maher reviewed the outage notification processes and it was determined that the response did not agree with SGAT language. Maher will explore the SGAT issue with the Qwest attorney.

Judy Lee opened the meeting on September 6th with a request from Qwest for a change to the agenda. Given that so much discussion had taken place at the September 5th meeting regarding legal/regulatory issues, Qwest asked that Qwest could review its legal/regulatory positions regarding CMP with the Re-Design team. There were no objections to the agenda change, and Judy Lee introduced Andy Crain-Qwest attorney. Nancy Lubamersky-Qwest Public Policy was also on the conference bridge. Andy Crain reviewed what was happening in the 271 workshops. Crain stated that the workshops are designed for the parties to discuss issues and reach consensus on how issues will be resolved. Crain stated that the workshop process could not work for change management, because changes to the CMP process could not be agreed to in the workshops, because all changes to CMP need to be made in the CMP process. Crain stated that was why items were deferred to the Re-Design team. Crain went on to say that the results of the Re-Design team will be filed with the Colorado Commission, and that CMP continues to be a subject in the 271 proceeding. Crain stated that the reason that the two documents filed in the Colorado SGAT exhibits were being revised by the Re-Design team, and that it was anticipated that there would be ongoing revisions to those documents through the CMP process. Crain explained that this was the reason the recommendation was made by Qwest to remove Exhibits G and H relating to CMP from the SGATs. Tom Dixon-WorldCom asked if Qwest was contemplating workshops. *WORLDCOM DIXON COMMENT: further 271 workshops to discuss CMP. Crain stated "no".* Nancy Lubamersky-Qwest answered that CMP was an operational undertaking, and that the Re-Design team was established to let the "experts" improve CMP for all involved. Lubamersky stated that the CMP Re-Design efforts would be brought forward to the commissions, but were meant to be resolved in the Re-Design team and not in 271 workshops. Dixon-WorldCom asked how the Re-Design team was going to deal with regulatory issues. Dixon went on to identify five points that needed resolution. The points were:

1). Dispute resolution will end up at a regulatory body and there needs to be a defined and agreed to process.
2). Exhibits G and H regarding CMP and Escalation do belong in the SGAT. All CLECs need to know what had been committed to in CMP.
3). Voting rights need specific definitions.
4). Should Qwest have veto based on majority rule?
5). Prioritization rules need to be specifically defined.

Crain stated that if it is important to keep CMP documents as part of the SGAT, that would be considered and a response would be provided at the next Re-Design meeting. Liz Balvin-WorldCom stated that it was important for new CLECs to have the CMP language in the SGAT. Crain also stated that Qwest was to provide a CMP status document to the Colorado Commission on October 10th. . *WORLDCOM DIXON COMMENT: Dixon requested that the CMP members be permitted to review and comment upon the status document before it was submitted to the Colorado Commission. Crain agreed to do so.* Dixon stated that the Re-Design team needed to review the documentation that was being submitted, and compare that to the existing documentation. Crain asked how updates to the CMP documentation should be handled. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that a process needed to be set for document review. She further stated that after the October 10th filing the commission should get monthly updates on the

progress. Quintana stated that she agreed with Dixon on the five points, and that everything was being deferred to the Re-Design team.

Discussion then moved to the PCATs and how CLEC comments are incorporated into the PCATs. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the PCAT review sessions do not incorporate changes, but are a readout of the Qwest changes. Clauson went on to say that Eschelon has received notices for meetings, but the notification time is not sufficient and that the meetings have been poorly managed. Balvin-WorldCom stated Bill Campbell has solicited input on products and most recently WorldCom had submitted comments on line splitting. Lubamersky-Qwest stated that Qwest was increasing documentation associated with the PCAT, and that changes to the PCAT were being verified to incorporate comments. Quintana again reiterated that the Re-Design team had a tremendous amount of tasks ahead including notifications and tech pubs. Dixon-WorldCom concurred with Quintana that the level of effort was significant and involved re-design of numerous processes and issues. Lubamersky stated that this effort was an augment to existing processes and did not warrant being referred to as re-design. Balvin stated that this effort was a total redesign of all CMP processes. Schultz-Qwest stated that the redesign team was working on seven key elements, and that those elements were in effect prior to the Re-Design effort being established. Balvin agreed that this was not starting from scratch, but prior to Re-Design there was no collaborative design of the processes which impact the CLECs. . *WORLDCOM BALVIN COMMENT: I recall my statement to include the fact that the process implemented by Qwest was not collaboratively established thus the need to totally revamp to process was required and that the CLEC community agreed to use as a starting point the OBF guidelines on change management.* Dixon asked if all members understood their roles and the results they were to deliver, and that a stipulation was made by Qwest at the 271 workshop that all this work would be done within 45 days of closing the workshops. Clauson stated that there were significant issues that needed to be resolved including processes for utilizing Qwest Service Managers, knowing when things were a legal/regulatory issue, identifying documentation for processes such as network outages including SGAT discrepancies. Clauson again stated that it would be very difficult to determine when items required legal/regulatory representation. Sharon Van Meter-ATT stated that having separate legal/regulatory meetings would cause problems because the operations folks needed to understand legal/regulatory issues and vice versa. Quintana stated she assumed Qwest would not have problems making changes to the SGAT CMP language. Crain again asked if it was important to the group to have language in the SGAT. Dixon stated that the group had several action items including,

1). Making the 18 item checklist an action item list.
2). Developing the status report to be filed and reviewing/revising with the Re-Design team.
3). How do we implement based on the stipulation that processes will be done within 45 days?
4). Is this an augment or a redesign?

Crain agreed that the redesign effort needed to proceed and that the discussion on augment vs. redesign was a semantics discussion. Lubamersky stated that CMP would be a constantly changing process and that this effort will be ongoing with continuous improvement. Gindlesberger-Covad restated that this was a redesign and that the discussion was one of semantics. Crain stated the Re-Design effort was an open forum to discuss all change management and that was the charter for the team. Discussion then turned to changes that were being implemented as the redesign effort was taking place. Balvin-WorldCom stated that the ROC had brought up a Qwest meeting for LSR exceptions that had taken place on Friday, August 31st. In that meeting, Qwest requested that a vote be taken to move forward with the CLECs attending the call. Clauson asked if that was a separate process, because the Re-Design team had not defined how and when vote would be taken. Van Meter-ATT stated that on the call the CLECs stated that a vote could not take place until the material was discussed within CLEC organizations and with all CLECs impacted. Osborne-Miller-ATT stated that they told the Qwest Conference call attendees that a vote could not be taken. Lubamersky stated that this particular call was not associated with CMP Re-Design and that there was a review of the process taking place. Wicks–Allegiance asked if going forward there would be any votes outside of CMP. Balvin stated that in the e-mail notification of the conference call there was no indication that a vote would be taken. Schultz-Qwest stated that this vote circumstance would be run to ground. Karen

Clauson-Eschelon stated that the Redesign team needed to develop an interim exception process to make certain that if CMP exceptions are required there is a mechanism in place to handle those exceptions. There was discussion regarding whether a CLEC could submit change comments during a training session. Schultz-Qwest will follow up on training and how the feedback loop is managed. Judy Lee then recapped that the Re-Design team would be involved in reviewing the status report being filed with the Colorado Commission, and that Andy Crain would review that with the group. Discussion then moved to whether the name of the Re-design team should be changed. Clauson stated that this was the name on the web site and the name should not change. It was decided to leave the name as Re-Design. *WORLDCOM BALVIN COMMENT: I recall a great deal more discussion on this topic but the end result was that CLECs believed their role as a CMP re-design core member was to develop with Qwest a collaborative change management process. It was determined that if Qwest felt it appropriate to change the name and purpose of these re-design session that a CR would need to be initiated and discussed by the Re-design members for resolution.*

The Re-Design team then began review of the red-lined document. Clauson-Eschelon requested that all changes submitted be incorporated into a single main document, and that had been the original request of the team. The Re-Design team developed a revision to the Objectives statement from the July 11th meeting. Additionally, language was developed for the interim exception process. Production /Support language was added to the document, and it was agreed that Qwest would provide revisions to the original redlined document using the submitted Table of Contents. Clauson stated that the table of contents could be used but that it may be modified. There was no disagreement. Dixon-WorldCom stated that language for all processes needed to be very specific, with all terms defined. Wicks-Allegiance asked that the document be named "Wholesale Master Redlined Document". Revisions were incorporated and the document is attached.

Issues/Action Items:

- *#11C: Sample distribution package*
- *#13D: Add English title to all new and existing CRs posted on the CMP web site*
- *#14D: Qwest to adopt a single notification naming convention*
- *#23: Provide 'upcoming' event calendar on CMP web site*
- *#24: Establish a CMP POC list*
- *#30-#36, #41: Revise naming convention matrix*
- *#38: Point-of-contact for mail-out notices*
- *#39: Provide screen shots of the modified CMP web site*
- *#42: Notification process for Network changes and outages*
- *#48: Develop CLEC-CLEC Impasse Resolution Process for re-design effort*
- *#50: Change Request Flow Chart*
- *#54: Add action item verbiage to the CMP re-design meeting minutes*
- *#55: Timeline for August 14 and 16 meeting minutes*
- *#56: Revise August 7 – 8 meeting minutes*
- *#60: CLEC contact information*
- *#61: Archive on the CMP web site*
- *#62: Logistics for Minneapolis CMP re-design sessions in October*
- *#63: Communicate results of CMP re-design effort at Qwest sponsored CLEC Forum/s*
- *#64: Allegiance to re-introduce a previously denied OSS CR*
- *#65: Core Team to provide input to CLEC-Qwest Impasse Resolution Process*
- *#66: Qwest to provide SGAT language on CMP*
- *#67: Core Team to determine if Exhibits G and H should be included in SGAT*
- *#68: Core Team to address COIL 18 points*
- *#69: Review Qwest's status report and redlined document prior to planned October filing*
- *#70: Process for CLEC review of Tech Pub and PCAT changes*
- *#71: Notification of production problems*
- *#72: Process if CLEC doesn't agree with Qwest's reply to CR*

- *#73: Roles and responsibilities of Service Managers and Sales Managers*

Attachment 1

September 5 and 6, 2001 CLEC – Qwest CMP Re-design Working Session

Attendance Record

Core Team Members

9/5	9/6	Company	Last Name	First Name	Email	Phone	Comments
x	x	Allegiance Telecom	Wicks	Terry	terry.wicks@algx.com	469-259-4438	
x	x	AT&T	Bahner	Terry	Tbahner@att.com	303-298-6149	
x	x	AT&T	Osborne-Miller	Donna	dosborne@att.com	303-298-6178	
x	x	AT&T	Van Meter	Sharon	svanmeter@att.com	303-298-6178	
		Avista	Thiessen	Jim	jthiessen@avistacom.net	509-444-4089	
x	x	Covad Communications	Gindlesberger	Larry	Lgindles@covad.com	330-209-5499	
		Electric Light Wave	Gunderson	Peder	peder_gunderson@eli.net	360-816-3429	
x	x	Eschelon Telecom	Clauson	Karen	klclauson@eschelon.com	612-436-6026	
		Eschelon Telecom	Powers	Lynne	flpowers@eschelon.com	612-436-6642	
		Eschelon Telecom	Stichter	Kathy	klstichter@eschelon.com	612-436-6022	
		Integra	Littler	Bill	blittler@integratelecom.com	503-793-5923	
		McLeod	Sprague	Michelle	msprague@mcleodusa.com	319-790-7402	
x	x	Qwest	Green	Wendy	Wteepe@qwest.com	303-382-8124	
x	x	Qwest	Maher	Jim	Jxmaher@qwest.com	303-896-5637	Scribe
x	x	Qwest	Rossi	Matt	mrossi@uswest.com	303-896-5432	
x	x	Qwest	Routh	Mark	mrouth@uswest.com	303-896-3781	
x	x	Qwest	Schultz	Judy	jmschu4@qwest.com	303-965-3725	
		Qwest	Thompson	Jeff	jlthomp@qwest.com	303-896-7276	
%	%	SBC Telecom	Lees	Marcia	Marcia.lees@sbc.com	314-340-1131	
		Scindo Networks	DeGarlais	Vince	vcedegarlais@scindonetworks.com	720-528-4207	
		Scindo Networks	Gavrilis	George	Gtgavrilis@scindonetworks.com	720-528-4193	
x	x	Sprint	Evans	Sandy	sandra.k.evans@mail.sprint.com	913-433-8499	
x	x	WorldCom	Balvin	Liz	liz.balvin@wcom.com	303-217-7305	
x	x	WorldCom	Hines	LeiLani	LeiLani.Jean.Hines@wcom.com	303 217-7340	

% = Participant was present on specific date via conference line

Other Participants

Attachment 1

September 5 and 6, 2001 CLEC – Qwest CMP Re-design Working Session

Attendance Record

9/5	9/6	Company	Last Name	First Name	Email	Phone	Comments
		Accenture	Powell	Mark			
x	x	AT&T	Hydock	Mike	mkydock@att.com	303-298-6653	
	x	AT&T	McCue	Bill		Pager 888-858-7243 pin 108884	
%		CapGemini	Ferris	Robyn			
x	x	Colorado PUC	Quintana	Becky	Becky.guintana@dora.state.co.us	303-894-2881	
		KPMG Consulting	Nobs	Christian	cnobs@kpmg.com	415-831-1323	
x	x	KPMG Consulting	Yeung	Shun (Sam)	shunyeung@kpmg.com	212-954-6351	
%		Qwest	Blackmun	Jarby			
		Qwest	LeMon	Lynne	Llemon@qwest.com	303-965-6321	
%		Telcordia	Thompson	Nancy			
x	x	WorldCom	Dixon	Tom	Thomas.f.Dixon@wcom.com	303-390-6206	

Facilitator

x	x	XTel Solutions, Inc.	Lee	Judy	soytofu@pacbell.net	650-743-8597	

% = Participant was present on specific date via conference line

Attachment 2

Working Session to Negotiate
A Modified Change Management Process

Wednesday, September 5 (10 am to 5 pm Mountain Time) and
Thursday, September 6, 2001 (9 am to 5 pm Mountain Time)
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO

Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304 passcode: 7101617 (hit #)

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5
AGENDA

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction (10 am – 10:15 am MT)	Judy Schultz, Qwest
• Review Core Team Membership	
• Review Agenda	Judy Lee, Facilitator
Discussion and Status (10:15 am – 4 pm MT) (includes Break and working lunch)	All

- Issues and Action Items:
  - "Mock-up" of A Monthly CMP Meeting Distribution Package (Action #11C)
  - Naming Convention for Web Site and Notices (Actions #13F (status), #14D, #30-33, #35-36, #37-41, #43, #44—Judy Schultz/Jarby Blackmun)
  - Change Request (CR) Process—Flowchart (Action #50—Judy Schultz)
  - Revised draft—Procedures on Voting and Impasse Resolution Process (Action #48—Terry Bahner)
  - Others (Actions #13D, #23, #24, #54, #55, #56)
- Feedback on Final August 14 and 16 Meeting Minutes and Discussion Elements
- Review Table of Contents
- Review and Discuss Qwest's detailed draft (including Actions #17A-C, #34, #49, #51-53)—may need to continue discussion on September 6
  - Change Request Initial Process
  - Change to An Existing Interface
    - Application-to-Application
    - Graphical User Interface
  - Prioritization
  - Exceptions

Next Session (4 pm to 4:30 pm MT)	All
• Determine discussion items for September 6	
• Determine what supporting material is needed for the session	
Closing Remarks (4:30 pm to 5 pm MT)	Judy Schultz
Adjourn	

Attachment 2

Modified Change Management Process

Wednesday, September 5 (10 am to 5 pm Mountain Time) and
Thursday, September 6, 2001 (9 am to 5 pm Mountain Time)
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO

Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304 passcode: 7101617 (hit #)

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6
AGENDA

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction (9 am – 9:15 am MT)	Judy Schultz, Qwest
• Review Core Team Membership	
• Review Agenda	Judy Lee, Facilitator
Discussion and Status (9:15 am – 4 pm MT) (including Break and 1-hour lunch)	All
• Issues and Action Items (from Sep 5 meeting)	
• Review and Discuss Qwest's detailed draft (continue from Sep 5)	
– Change Request Initial Process	
– Change to An Existing Interface	
– Application-to-Application	
– Graphical User Interface	
– Prioritization	
– Exceptions	
• Notification Process for Network Changes and Outages (Action #42)	
Next Session (4 pm – 4:30 pm MT)	All
• Determine discussion items for the next working session	
• Determine what supporting material is needed for the next session	
Quick Fix Implementation (4:30 pm – 4:45 pm MT)	Judy Schultz
Closing Remarks (4:45 pm - 5 pm MT)	Judy Schultz
Adjourn	

SAMPLE CMP Monthly Meeting Product/ Process

Distribution Package for REVIEW

Sample—CMP Meeting Distribution Package

CMP Monthly Meeting – Product/Process

1:00 pm – 5:00 pm (Denver MT)
Some 3rd Wednesday
Some Building in Denver
Conference Bridge – 1-877-847-0338, PC 6738816

AGENDA

- Introductions/Roll Call **(1:00 – 1:15)**
- Review Meeting Minutes from previous CMP Meeting **(1:15 – 2:00)**
  - See Attachment A – Previous Meeting Minutes
- Review CLEC Change Requests **(2:00 – 3:30)**
  - See Attachment B – CR Listing
  - See Attachment C - CR Status Reports
- 15 minute Break **(3:30 – 3:45)**
- Review Qwest Mail Outs **(3:45 – 4:00)**
- CMP Re-Design Meeting information **(4:00 – 4:30)**
  All Re-Design information can be found on the web at:
  http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/CMP/redesign.html
  - See Attachment D – CMP Re-Design Core Team roster
  - See Attachment E – CMP Meeting minutes from most recent CMP Re-Design meeting
  - See Attachment F – CMP Working Red Lined Process Document
- Review/Adjust Team Monthly Meeting Schedule **(4:30 – 4:45)**
  - Third Wednesday of the Month – Afternoon
  - Next meeting – Some 3rd Wednesday
- Review any New Business **(4:45 – 5:00)**

Sample—CMP Meeting Distribution Package

ATTACHMENT A

XX/XX/01 Product/Process CMP Meeting Minutes

ride the light Qwest		**CLEC CMP Meeting Product & Process**
	Date:	**August 15, 2001**
	Time	**1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. MT**
	Place:	**1005 17th Street, Denver, CO**
	Conference Call-In No.:	

Attendees * Attended by Conference Call	**Name/Company:**	**Title:**
	Mark Routh, Qwest	CMP Manager
	Matt Rossi, Qwest	CMP Manager
	Jeff Thompson, Qwest	Director – IT
	LeiLani Hines, WorldCom	Carrier Management
	Terry Wicks, Allegiance	LEC Manager
	Larry Gindlesberger	Sr. Project Manager
	Kathy Stichter, Eschelon Telecom	ILEC Relations Manager
	Lynne Powers, Eschelon Telecom	VP of Provisioning & Repair
	Karen Clauson, Eschelon Telecom	Director of Interconnection
	Donna Osborne-Miller, AT&T	Manager
	Terry Bahner, AT&T	Supervisor
	Jonathan Spangler,AT&T	Supervisor
	Ann Binkley, Qwest	Sr. Service Manager
	Judy Schultz, Qwest	Director, Change Management
	Jim Beers, Qwest	Change Management
	Judy Lee, Qwest	Facilitator – Re-design
	Christian Nobs, KPMG Consulting	Sr. Consultant
	Shun Yeung, KPMG Consulting	Consultant
	Jeff Lords, Qwest	Manager
	Alan Zimmerman, Qwest	Manager
	Nancy Hoag, Qwest	Product Manager
	Todd Mead, Qwest	Change Management
	Ric Martin, Qwest	Change Management
	Rebecca Spencer, Qwest	Manager, Training & Development
	Doug Anderson, Qwest	Consultant
	Mark Coyne, Qwest	Team Lead, Process
	Sue Burson, Qwest	Director, Process
	William Campbell, Qwest	Director, Product
	*Susan Bliss, Qwest	Director, Service Delivery
	*Russ Urevig, Qwest	Supervisor, Program/Project Management
	*Chris Henderson, Qwest	Sr. Process Analyst
	*Deni Toye, Qwest	Sr. Process Analyst
	*Linda Hendricks, Qwest	Lead Project Analyst
	*Denny Graham, Qwest	Staff Compliance Representative
	*Mark Powell, Accenture	Trading Partner Management
	*Jim Thiessen, Avista	

Sample—CMP Meeting Distribution Package

	*Jean John, Quintessant *Christine Mohrfeld, McLeod *Bonnie Johnson, Eschelon Telecom	Requirements Analyst ILEC Relations Manager

LEC Manager		Action
1.0	**Introduction of Attendees**	
1.1	Introduction of the participants and roll call was made.	
1.2	Judy Schultz, Introduced Jim Beers as Qwest's, facilitator for the Change Management Meeting	
1.3	Jim Beers, requested all participants positive attitude and explained that the goal was to try and capture Action Items in the body of the meeting minutes and move Action Items pertaining to CRs to the respective CR Status History.	
2.0	**Action Item Log Review**	
2.1	**Item 25 -** Matt Rossi indicated that Bill Campbell is to be here later and additional discussion could be made when Bill arrives. Matt advised that the following documents represented Qwest's response to the Action Item: ❖ Release Notice 5467145 found on WEB page – Archive. ❖ Change Request response, pg. 21 of Distribution package. ❖ Change Request 5263637, pg. 39 of Distribution Package. ❖ Mail Out sent on 8/10/01 – NETW.080801F.00038.OSBuild Disclosure – Release of Outside Plant Network Build Disclosure ❖ Nancy Hoag – to read out Qwest's CR response. Lynne Powers indicated this a proper request through Wholesale. She wanted to know how Qwest orders cancelled in held and customers were notified for Qwest's Retail (I'm not sure what you meant b y this). Lynne wants a written response. They believe Qwest retail orders are held indefinitely, while CLEC orders are cancelled. Karen Clauson indicated that the response does not answer action # 25. She still believes that Qwest's build policy is discriminatory and that only Qwest orders are held. She would like to get policy in writing. She wants to determine: 1. Is it discrimanatory. 2. Because Qwest controls the timing, is Retail getting notification same time as CLEC? 3. Does not believe that Qwest's e-mail response is consistent with Minnesota Ruling. She provided Garth Morissal at Eschelon as a reference to contact. Susie Bliss indicated that Qwest needs to be clear in our response. Lynne Powers questioned if this new process is being issued for Retail. Susie Bliss stated that she would get an understanding of the Retail Process by Friday August 17th. Lynne Powers indicated that Qwest uses IDLC, which limits CLECs availability. Karen Clauson advised that Copper shouldn't be the only availability. Larry Gindlesberger stated that this is where facilities are exhausted. Lynne Powers indicated that Qwest could limit future builds to encourage IDLC. Denny – Qwest is working on IDLC where we have IDLC will make available POTs. Jim Beers will set up a clarification meeting to review the Change Request.	S Bliss J Beers

Sample—CMP Meeting Distribution Package

ATTACHMENT B

CR Listing

Summary - Wholesale Process/Product

CRNumber	*Title*			
Organization	*Submitter*		*Products Impacted*	*Director*
Current Status	*Area Impacted*	*Shirt Size*	*Interfaces Impacted*	*Owner*
5263569	Loop reclamation			
Wholesale Process	Powers, Lynn		Centrex, Resale, Unbundled Loop, UNE-P	Bliss, Susan
Submitted	Ordering	N/A		Hoag, Nancy
5263637	Installation of adequate facilities and reduction in number of held orders			
Wholesale Process	Powers, Lynn		Centrex, Resale, Unbundled Loop, UNE-P	To Be, Determined
Evaluation	Ordering	N/A		Buckmaster, Cindy
5371475	Allow non design-affecting due date changes for unbundled loop orders			
Wholesale Process	Powers, Lynn		Unbundled loop	To Be, Determined
Submitted	Ordering	N/A		Hoag, Nancy
5432820	Update SAG records to match LEC records			
Wholesale Process	Sprague, Michelle		Centrex, Unbundled Loop	Thompson, Jeff
Evaluation	Pre-Ordering	N/A		Thompson, Jeff
5548229	Same day pair change during test and turn-up (day of cut)			
Wholesale Process	Wicks, Terry		Unbundled loop, LNP	To Be, Determined
Submitted	Ordering	N/A		Toye, Deni
5548341	Collocation end to end testing			
Wholesale Process	Osborne-Miller, Donna		Collocation	Campbell, William
Submitted	Ordering	N/A		Nelson, Steve

ATTACHMENT C

CLEC CR Reports

http://www.uswest.com/wholesale/cicmp/changerequest_pp.html

Sample—CMP Meeting Distribution Package

Open Product/Process CR Detailed

CR #	*Title*	*Current Status*	*Organization*	*Area Impacted*	*Products Impacted*
5263137	Re-use facilities for CLEC-CLEC carrier changes	Submitted	Wholesale Process	Ordering	Centrex, Resale, Unbundled

Director: Bliss, Susan
Submitter: Powers, Lynn
Owner: Urevig, Russ
CR PM: McKee, Lyman

Description Of Change

Qwest should change its process so that Qwest will re-use facilities for CLEC-to-CLEC carrier changes. When an end-user customer changes carriers from one CLEC to another, Qwest has indicated to Eschelon that CLECs must order new facilities, because Qwest does not allow a CLEC to request re-use of the same facilities used by the other CLEC to serve the same customer. In one situation, for example, Eschelon placed an order to change an end-user customer from the on-net facilities of another CLEC to the on-net facilities of Eschelon. Qwest indicated that Eschelon must order new facilities and, when Eschelon did so, Qwest placed the order in held status. The other CLEC provided its PONs to Eschelon for that CLEC's disconnect of its loops. Eschelon re-submitted the order, identified the PONs, and requested re-use of those facilities. Qwest responded that CLECs are not allowed to request re-use of CLEC facilities. Eschelon cancelled the order and resubmitted it later. The order again went in held status. The order is still in held status. (Eschelon has provided the specific information for this and other situations to its account manager.) Ordering new facilities, instead of re-using facilities, can result in delay, additional costs, and service disruption or downtime. Please modify Qwest's processes so that Qwest will re-use facilities for CLEC-to-CLEC carrier changes.

Status History

12/01/00 Submitted
12/01/00 New to be validated
12/04/00 New to be reviewed
12/06/00 Status changed to Reviewed - under consideration
12/06/00 - Will Discuss during UNE-P discussion marked as agenda item for
12/20 Product/Process CICMP Meeting
12/15/00 – CR still under investigation but will address at the
12/20 CICMP Meeting (SB)
1/10/01 – Will be addressed during the 1/11 – 1/12 CLEC to CLEC UNE-P meeting and results discussed in the January CICMP Meeting (RU)
2/14/01 – Product Announcement for a formalized process to enable CLEC to CLEC conversions of Unbundled Loop with Re-use of facilities or same loop type services communicated to CICMP team via email and posted on CICMP web site. (RN # 5393537). (RU – MR)
2/21/01 – Closing CR is dependant on requested revision to RN #5393543 – CLEC Unbundled Loop to CLEC Resale
3/19/01 – Revision to RN #5393543 complete and undergoing internal approval. Date of Release pending approval. (BD)
3/27/01 – Revision to RN #5393537 - CLEC Unbundled Loop to CLEC Unbundled Loop Re-use of Facilities - Revision A sent to CICMP team. BD-MR)
4/18/01 – Additional revision needed to CLEC Unbundled Loop – CLEC Unbundled Loop and CLEC Unbundled Loop – Resale release notifications previously released to incorporate new policy on obtaining Circuit ID from OLSP (MR)
4/30/01 – Revision "B" to RN #5393537, RN #5393543, and RN #5467108 sent to CICMP team incorporating new procedure for obtaining Circuit ID's. (MR)
5/16/01 – Lynne Powers request to remain open to verify newly implemented circuit attainment process to be put in place on 5/25. (MR)
6/20/01 – Process implementation for enhanced Circuit ID Process to be verified and presented in interim meeting to be scheduled by Qwest prior to the July CICMP Meeting. (MR)
7/10/01 – Interim conference call conducted to discuss CLEC to CLEC conversions – meeting minutes sent to the CICMP team on 7/12/01 (MR)
7/13/01 – Drafted response sent to the CICMP Team via email (MR)
8/15/01 – CLEC CMP Meeting Product & Process CR 5263137 Matt Rossi advised that the Response to the CR was in the material handout. Lynne Powers advise they are accepting orders OK, but cut-over is not going smoothly. Bonnie thought the orders were not being worked to the right place. The quality team is evaluating the issue under AI # 308 in systems. Judy Schultz is to evaluate where issue best resides (Product & Process or Systems). J Schultz by next meeting

Project Meetings

Kathy,
This confirms our conversation this morning that Change Request 5263137 can be closed based on Qwest's response dated

Sample—CMP Meeting Distribution Package

August 7, 2001 presented at the 8/15/01 meeting. In addition, this is based on Qwest tracking System Action Item 308 as a separate request and addressing the quality issued experienced during cut-over.

Qwest Response

July 13, 2001
This letter is in response to the following CLEC Change Request Forms #5263137, dated December 1, 2000 and #5608177 and #5608353, dated June 13, 2001. All of these Change Requests pertain to the CLEC to CLEC Migration process. The revised process was released via the Co-Provider Industry Change Management Process (CICMP) on May 25, 2001.

Re-use of facilities for CLEC to CLEC carrier changes, improving the CLEC to CLEC reuse of facilities process and to ensure Nondiscrimination.

Response: The Qwest Release Notification Forms #5393537 (CLEC Unbundled Loop to CLEC Unbundled Loop), #5393543 (CLEC Unbundled Loop to CLEC Resale), and #5467108 (CLEC LNP with Unbundled Loop to CLEC Unbundled Loop) Revision B, released on May 25, 2001, noted changes in the Pre-Order section that the requirement to obtain the "Circuit Identification Number from the OLSP" is optional. Both Eschelon and Allegiance provided Qwest with examples of orders that were rejected by Qwest due to no Circuit Identification Number provided. After gap analysis, it was determined that additional training of Qwest Service Center personnel and updates to Service Delivery M&Ps were required. The following measures have been implemented:

An updated Multi Channel Communicator (MCC) New or Changed Information Procedure was issued on July 9, 2001.
Issued to target Qwest internal personnel in the Wholesale Customer Care, Customer Service, Error Group, Held Order/Escalation, Order Processing and Order Resolution organizations.
Topic of the MCC: "CLEC to CLEC Migration of an Unbundled Loop and Unbundled Loop to other products."
CLEC to CLEC Migration is defined as; unbundled to unbundled, unbundled to resale, unbundled to Centrex resale, unbundled to retail.

Emphasis placed on processing orders without circuit ids (ECCKT's) on LSR requesting migration.
States included in this communication are; AZ, CO, IA, ID-N, ID-S, MN, MT, ND, NE, NM, OR, Outside 14 State Region, SD, UT, WA and WY. All internal job aids and on-line support documentation have been updated.
Qwest Service Center specific training sessions are currently in progress for both center coaches and center personnel. The training will be on going to ensure process compliance.

Sincerely
Nancy J. Hoag
Wholesale Product Manager

August 7, 2001
This letter is in response to the following CLEC Change Request Forms #5263137, dated December 1, 2000 and #5608177 and #5608353, dated June 13, 2001. All of these Change Requests pertain to the CLEC to CLEC Migration process. The revised process was released via the Co-Provider Industry Change Management Process (CICMP) on May 25, 2001.

Re-use of facilities for CLEC to CLEC carrier changes, improving the CLEC to CLEC reuse of facilities process and to ensure Nondiscrimination.

Response: The Qwest Release Notification Forms #5393537 (CLEC Unbundled Loop to CLEC Unbundled Loop), #5393543 (CLEC Unbundled Loop to CLEC Resale), and #5467108 (CLEC LNP with Unbundled Loop to CLEC Unbundled Loop) Revision B, released on May 25, 2001, noted changes in the Pre-Order section that the requirement to obtain the "Circuit Identification Number from the OLSP" is optional. Both Eschelon and Allegiance provided Qwest with examples of orders that were rejected by Qwest due to no Circuit Identification Number provided. After gap analysis, it was determined that additional training of Qwest Service Center personnel and updates to Service Delivery M&Ps were required. The following measures have been implemented:

An updated Multi Channel Communicator (MCC) New or Changed Information Procedure was issued on July 9, 2001.
Issued to target Qwest internal personnel in the Wholesale Customer Care, Customer Service, Error Group, Held Order/Escalation, Order Processing and Order Resolution organizations.
Topic of the MCC: "CLEC to CLEC Migration of an Unbundled Loop and Unbundled Loop to other products."
CLEC to CLEC Migration is defined as; unbundled to unbundled, unbundled to resale, unbundled to Centrex resale.
Emphasis placed on processing orders without circuit ids (ECCKT's) on LSR requesting migration.
States included in this communication are; AZ, CO, IA, ID-N, ID-S, MN, MT, ND, NE, NM, OR, Outside 14 State Region, SD, UT, WA and WY. All internal job aids and on-line support documentation have been updated.
Qwest Service Center specific training sessions are currently in progress for both center coaches and center personnel. The training will be on going to ensure process compliance.

Sincerely
Nancy J. Hoag
Qwest Wholesale Product Team

ATTACHMENT D

CMP Re-Design Team roster

Last Name	First Name	Company	Email	Phone
Team Members				
Bahner	Terry	AT&T	tbahner@att.com	303-298-6149
Balvin	Liz	WorldCom	liz.balvin@wcom.com	303-217-7305
Clauson	Karen	Eschelon Telecom	klclauson@eschelon.com	612-436-6026
DeGarlais	Vince	Scindo Networks	vcdegarlais@scindonetworks.com	720-528-4207
Evans	Sandy	Sprint	sandra.k.evans@mail.sprint.com	913-433-8499
Gavrilis	George	Scindo Networks	Gtgavrilis@scindonetworks.com	720-528-4193
Gindlesberger	Larry	Covad Communications		
Green	Wendy	Qwest	wteepe@uswest.com	303-896-1079
Gunderson	Peder	Electric Light Wave	peder_gunderson@eli.net	360-816-3429
Hines	LeiLani	WorldCom	LeiLani.Jean.Hines@wcom.com	303 217-7340
Lees	Marcia	SBC Telecom	marcia.lees@sbc.com	314-340-1131
Littler	Bill	Integra Telecom	bill.littler@integratelecom.com	360-213-1108
Maher	Jim	Qwest	Jxmaher@qwest.com	303-896-5637
Osborne-Miller	Donna	AT&T	dosborne@att.com	303-298-6178
Powers	Lynne	Eschelon Telecom	flpowers@eschelon.com	612-436-6642
Rossi	Matt	Qwest	mrossi@uswest.com	303-896-5432
Routh	Mark	Qwest	mrouth@uswest.com	303-896-3781
Schultz	Judy	Qwest	jmschu4@qwest.com	303-965-3725
Sprague	Michelle	McLeodUSA	msprague@mcleodusa.com	319-790-7402
Stichter	Kathy	Eschelon Telecom	klstichter@eschelon.com	612-436-6022
Thiessen	Jim	Avista	jthiessen@avistacom.net	509-444-4089
Van Meter	Sharon	AT&T	svanmeter@att.com	303-298-6178
Wicks	Terry	Allegiance Telecom	terry.wicks@algx.com	469-259-4438
Facilitator				
Lee	Judy	Xtel Solutions, Inc.	soytofu@pacbell.net	650-743-8597
Observers				
Powell	Mark	Accenture	launch-now.notify@ cscoe.accenture.com	
Quintana	Becky	Colorado PUC	Becky.Quintana@dora.state.co.us	303-894-2881
Woodhouse	Rick	KPMG Consulting	rwoodhouse@kpmg.com	518-427-4849
Yeung	Sam	KPMG Consulting	shuyeung@kpmg.com	212-954-6351
Nobs	Christian	KPMG Consulting		
LeMon	Lynne	Qwest	Llemon@qwest.com	303-965-6321

Sample—CMP Meeting Distribution Package

ATTACHMENT E

Meeting Minutes from 7/19/01 meeting

FINAL MEETING NOTES

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
Thursday, July 19, 2001 Working Session

1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Junior Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Bridge line: 1-877-847-0304, pass code 7101617# (confirmation: 4397137)

NOTE: Qwest developed DRAFT Meeting Notes last week for the July 19 re-design working session and asked participants for their input. These FINAL Meeting Notes include comments in italics from the participants, while others were incorporated into these notes without the need for highlighting.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team ("Team") and other participants met today to begin re-designing the Change Management Process—refer to Attachment 1 for the Attendance Record. The working session highlights are summarized below—see Attachment 2 for the July 19 Agenda.

The Team used the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF) Issue 2233 version 2 framework to discuss the sections on Introduction, Scope and Administration. Input from participants was encouraged and considered in what is now known as the redlined Change Management Process re-design framework (refer to the last attachment). We agreed that all participants will take these meeting notes and the redlined framework back to their respective organization to obtain feedback on the proposed language for the Introduction, Scope and Administration sections before the next working session. In addition, the participants can share their organization's feedback (issues, concerns and comments) with the rest of the Team at the next re-design working session. *[Eschelon Comment: Participants may have additional comments at or before the next re-design working session.]*

RULES OF ORDER FOR THE RE-DESIGN WORKING SESSIONS

Participants discussed the three scenarios below to determine the role of third party software provider ("3rd Party Software Provider"), if any, as participants to re-design Qwest's Change Management Process.

- A) 3rd Party Software Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however, no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client (Process=Yes, Vote=No)
- B) 3rd Party Software Providers are allowed to 'voice' and 'vote' as any CLEC (Process and Vote=Yes)
- C) 3rd Party Software Providers are excluded from the core team (Process and Vote=No)

AT&T Comment: AT&T requests rules defining a quorum be included in the minutes when a 'vote' is recorded.

DECISION: The Team decided on another scenario (Scenario D) that 3rd Party Software Providers are invited to be part of the Core Team because of their valuable knowledge. But, the participants will not allow 3rd Party Software Providers to vote. However, if a Letter of Authorization ("LOA") is in effect with a specific CLEC-client for a specific working session, the

Sample—CMP Meeting Distribution Package

ATTACHMENT F

CMP Working Red Lined Process Document

Qwest
Wholesale Program

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process

Date: 09/10/99
12/28/99 Revised
02/16/00 Revised
11/10/00 Revised
03/13/01 Revised
03/30/01 Revised
05/11/01 Revised
08/29/01 Draft—CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Core Team

Table of Contents

3.3 Types of Changes ..... Error! Bookmar
3.3.1 CLEC Originated Change ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.3.2 Qwest Originated Change ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.3.3 Industry Guideline Change ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.3.4 Regulatory Change ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.4 Qualified CLECs ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.4.1 For New Interfaces ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.4.2 Changes to Existing Interfaces ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.4.3 Changes Involving OSS Business Rules ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.6 Change Request Initiation Process ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.6.1 CLEC-initiated Change Request (CR) Status Update Definitions ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.6.2 CLEC Submission of A Change Request ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.6.3 Qwest Tracking Log for New CLEC CRs ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.6.4 Qwest Validation for New CLEC CRs ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.6.5 Evaluate CLEC CRs and Review Qwest Release Notifications (RNs) ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.6.5.1 Present New CRs ..... Error! Bookmark n
3.6.5.2 Discuss CLEC CRs ..... Error! Bookmark n
4.0 PRIORITIZATION ..... ERROR! BOOKM
4.1 Guidelines ..... Error! Bookmark n

5.2 Change to an Existing Interface ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.2.1 Requirements Review ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.2.1.1 Draft Interface Release Requirements ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.2.1.2 Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.2.1.3 Walk Through of Draft Interface Release Requirements ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.2.1.4 CLEC Comments on Initial Draft Documentation Publication ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.2.1.5 Qwest Response to Comments ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.2.1.6 Content of Final Business Rules and Technical Specifications Release Requirements ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.3 Change to an Existing Graphical User Interface (GUI) ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.3.1 Requirements Review ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.3.1.1 Draft GUI Requirements ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.3.1.2 Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.3.1.3 CLEC Comments on Initial Draft Documentation Publication ..... Error! Bookmark n
5.3.1.4 Qwest Response to Comments ..... Error! Bookmark n

5.3.1.5 Content of Final Notification ..... Error! Bookmark n

8.0 EXCEPTIONS ..... Error! Bookmar

8.1 Exception Notice ..... Error! Bookmark n

8.2 CLEC Comments on Exception Request ..... Error! Bookmark n

8.3 Implementation of Exception ..... Error! Bookmark n

8.4 Regulatory Mandated Changes ..... Error! Bookmark n

8.5 Timeline Related to Regulatory Mandated Changes ..... Error! Bookmark n

Appendix A – List of Acronyms (TBD) ..... Error! Bookmark n

Attachment 4

Customer Letter Site Design, September 5, 2001

Customer_Letter_
Site_Design_Sept_

Change Request (CR) Work Flow

Error! Not a valid link.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

PROPOSAL—revised DRAFT on 8/14/2001

Procedures for Voting and the Impasse Resolution Process

Introduction

During the CLEC-Qwest working sessions to negotiate improvements to Qwest's Change Management Process ("CMP"), collaborative discussions will be held to achieve agreement on the process. Qwest and the CLEC participants will negotiate in good faith and will meet the goal of modifying Qwest's current Change Management Process. Participants at a working session will determine if there are any issues requiring a vote at the next working session. If there is an issue requiring a vote, the agenda for the next working session will reflect the item. In addition, the agenda will be distributed to the CLECs and posted on the CICMP Re-design web site a week in advance of the session. A CLEC may authorize another CLEC or a 3rd Party Software Provider through a Letter of Authorization ("LOA") to represent its position on a specific issue at a specific working session. (A generic LOA is posted on the CICMP Re-design web site.)

The Guiding Principles for the working session states that there is

One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules in the CLEC community and one vote for Qwest, making every effort to reach consensus.

CLEC Participants To Achieve A Single Position On An Issue

- CLEC Participants will make every effort to reach consensus of an issue
- If there is a dead-lock within the CLEC participants:
  - A sidebar collaborative discussion will be held among CLECs to achieve a single position (Qwest is not present)—During the sidebar meeting, a CLEC may invoke a 'vote' among the CLEC participants to allow each participant to record his/her Company's position. At the same time, a CLEC participant may wish to abstain from placing a vote. (Refer to section on Voting Tally Form.)
  - If there is a dead-lock, the CLEC participants will bring the scenarios back to the working session with Qwest to further discuss, or request to table.
  - CLEC-Qwest will collectively agree to table the decision until the next scheduled working session ('freeze period') to allow CLEC participants to hold collaborative discussions off-line to achieve one position.
  - If there is an impasse after the 'freeze period,' the CLEC participants will exercise the Impasse Resolution Process (CLEC-CLEC Impasse). *(NOTE: AT&T is leading an effort with the CLEC participants to develop a CLEC-CLEC Impasse Resolution Process by the September 5 re-design working session.)*

CLEC-Qwest To Achieve A Single Position On An Issue

- CLEC participants and Qwest will make every attempt to reach consensus on an issue
- If there is a dead-lock between the CLEC community and Qwest:
  - A collaborative discussion will be held to achieve consensus on one position
  - If still in a dead-lock, the issue will be tabled until the next scheduled working session to allow each party to work the issue off-line
  - If the CLEC community and Qwest are still in a dead-lock at the subsequent working session after another round of discussions, the Impasse Resolution Process will be invoked. (Refer to section on CLEC-Qwest Impasse Resolution Process)

Impasse Resolution Process

- CLEC-CLEC Impasse Process
  - (to be determined by September 5—lead: AT&T)
- CLEC-Qwest Impasse Process
  - CLEC and Qwest will table (second round of tabling) until the next scheduled working session to work with stakeholders and respective leadership team to achieve one position for the impasse issue
  - Another round of collaborative discussions will continue at the third subsequent working session to close on the issue
  - If still in a dead-lock, the CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Dispute Resolution Process will be executed.

CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Dispute Resolution Process

The CLEC participants and Qwest CMP representatives will make every attempt to resolve the issue through collaborative discussions and using the Impasse Resolution Process. However, if the result of the Impasse Resolution Process remains in a dead-lock, the CLEC participants and Qwest must agree that the issue is in an impasse. Upon this agreement between CLEC and Qwest participants, there are two options to resolve this specific issue. And they are:

- **Regulator**: If agreed upon by the CLEC participants (no LOA designees) and Qwest representative, CLEC participants (no LOA designees) and/or Qwest representatives may approach a Regulator with the impasse issue. All parties must agree to the terms and process for resolution by a Regulator.
- **3rd Party**: If agreed upon by the CLEC participants (no LOA designee) and Qwest, a third party may be hired to resolve the specific issue. All parties must agree to the terms and process for resolution by a 3rd Party, including the handling of fees.

Attachment—Voting Tally Form

Voting Tally Form

The Voting Tally Form serves as a collective record of the individual vote on a specific issue. The results of the tally may be submitted with the working session meeting minutes as an attached document. However, each CLEC or authorized LOA representative who voted may decline to publish its voting result.

The form will include the following information:

- *CMP Re-design Working Session*: The date of the working session that caused this 'vote' to occur
- *Date of Vote*: The date of occurrence
- *Issue*: The issue that is causing the vote
- *Scenario*: State each scenario/position for a vote. Each scenario will be labeled A, B, C, etc.
- *CLEC Company*: A CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Core Team member's or a participant's company name
- *Core Team Member*: Write the name of the member that will participate in a 'vote.' If CLEC Company Core Team member is absent and no LOA has been executed, write ABSENT. The Core Team member is responsible to inform Qwest if there are any changes to CLEC representation.
- *Participating CLEC*: Write the name of the participant (non-Core Team member) <u>and</u> Company that will participate in a 'vote.'
- *LOA To*: Name of authorized representative that will participate in a 'vote.' A LOA must be presented to the Core Team members and given to Judy Schultz-Qwest to retain in file.
- *OK to Share Result (yes or no):* The CLEC or authorized LOA representative must write 'yes' or 'no' in this box to allow or deny permission for Qwest to publish the result of his/her vote in the working session meeting minutes.
- *A, B, C, D*: Vote for a scenario by placing a 'X' in the appropriate box.
- *Abstain*: Any participant may abstain to place a vote by placing an "X" in the box
- *CLEC Consensus*: A designated CLEC will insert the consensus position. The designated CLEC will also articulate to the working session audience the CLEC position so there is only one statement of the unified CLEC position.
- *Qwest's Position*: Qwest will insert Qwest's position on the specific issue.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

PROPOSAL

Voting Tally Form

CMP Re-design Working Session:	
Date of Vote:	

Issue:	
Scenario A:	
Scenario B:	
Scenario C:	
Scenario D:	

CLEC Company	Core Team Member	LOA[1] To:	OK[2] to Share Result (yes/no)	Vote				
				A	B	C	D	
Allegiance Telecom								
AT&T								
Avista								
Covad Communications								
Electric Light Wave								
Eschelon Telecom								
Integra Telecom								
McLeod USA								
SBC Telecom								
Scindo Networks								
Sprint								
WorldCom								

[1] CLEC has a Letter of Authorization in file that entitles another CLEC or 3rd Party Software Provider to vote on its behalf. The LOA is given to Judy Schultz/Qwest to retain in file.

[2] Each voter must indicate by writing a 'Yes' or 'No' if permission is given or denied to publish his/her Company's voting result.

Voting Tally Form—continued

CMP Re-design Working Session:	
Date of Vote:	

Participating CLEC

CLEC Company	Core Team Member	LOA To:	OK to Share Result (yes/no)	Vote				
				A	B	C	D	

CLEC Consensus:	
Qwest's Position:	

Qwest-CLEC Change Management Process Re-design

OBJECTIVES

Revised 09/06/01

Collaboratively develop a detailed revised Change Management Process and an implementation schedule for the revised process. The revised process will include the following key elements:

OSS Interfaces[3]

- The Process shall address procedures for changes to OSS interfaces that impact the CLECs. [action item #17]
- A process to introduce or retire interfaces will be developed.

Product/Process and Technical Publication

The Process shall address procedures for product/process and technical publications. [action item #17]

Exception Process

- An Exception Process will be developed.

Escalation Process and Dispute Resolution Process

- The process will address Escalation and dispute resolution.

SGAT

[place-holder—action item #66-67]

---

[3] OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

Attachment 9

QWEST'S COLORADO APPLICATION TO PROVIDE IN-REGION INTERLATA SERVICE
COLORADO PUC DOCKET NUMBER 97I-198T
Workshop No. 6 (1st Session)
Section 12, General Terms and Conditions, CICMP, BFR
June 19 – 22, 2001

Issue ID #	SGAT #	Party/ Source	Description of Issue	Action/ Status	Due Date
CM-1		ATT	Clarity and accessibility of Qwest CICMP documents. CLECs seek to identify all documents that purport to explain how the CICMP process works. Qwest cites Exhibit H and its contents, which includes all documentation necessary to utilize the CICMP process and how to participate in that process. Documents that describe how the CICMP process works are available on the public domain, at URL: www.qwest.com/wholesale/cicmp. The website contains sublinks to documents including: ➢ CICMP Document (Exhibit G), a master document which refers to all other CICMP resources. ➢ Escalation Process (Exhibit H) ➢ Change Request Prioritization Process ➢ Release Notifications Qwest intends to further clarify CICMP documents are to be during the course of CICMP proceedings	**Open**	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-2		ATT	Definition and adequacy of Qwest's escalation and dispute resolution process. CLECs state that dispute resolution is intertwined with Qwest's escalation process, which is enumerated in CICMP Exhibit H (Exhibit 6-Qwest-47). CLECs contend there is no opportunity to resolve CICMP-related disputes absent a framework that recognizes that disputes, per se, can exist. CLECs argue that if a CLEC disagrees with Qwest's decision on a Change Request, an escalation process must be followed involving the Qwest management hierarchy. CLECs claim they can only voice their displeasure and but have no assurance their issues will be acted upon. CLECs contend Qwests proposed escalation process is unduly long (up to 17 business days, and possibly 30 days in some circumstance). CLECs want a dispute resolution process that would be binding on all parties involved with CICMP. ➢ CLECs contend there should be an opportunity for CLECs to challenge Release Notifications, to the extent they are substantial and could adversely impact the CLECs. ➢ CLECs argue that there should be a mechanism to challenge a Systems Change Proposal if there were disagreement and, in particular, if Qwest were continues on with the change. ➢ CLECs want to streamline the escalation process so that only one person within Qwest would be responsible, with authority to bind the company and make a decision within two business days. Disputes would thereafter be resolved by the Colorado Commission. Qwest contends that CICMP matters subject to escalation and dispute resolution would, in fact, primarily involve CLEC-provided change requests. As such, Qwest release notifications and any other process changes would not be subject to escalation and or dispute resolution in practical terms. Qwest points out that its procedures	**Open**	Discuss in July Workshop

QWEST'S COLORADO APPLICATION TO PROVIDE IN-REGION INTERLATA SERVICE
COLORADO PUC DOCKET NUMBER 97I-198T
Workshop No. 6 (1st Session)
Section 12, General Terms and Conditions, CICMP, BFR
June 19 – 22, 2001

Issue ID #	SGAT #	Party/ Source	Description of Issue	Action/ Status	Due Date
			already incorporate a provision which states that "disputes that cannot be resolved within Qwest's management structure are to be referred to an independent monitor."		
CM-3		ATT	Does Qwest have all five categories of changes in SBC documents?	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-4		ATT	Are there performance measurements for change management?	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-5		ATT	Is repair a process subject to change management?	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-6		ATT	How frequently are CICMP meetings scheduled?	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-7		ATT WCom	Are Qwest-generated CRs subject to CICMP?	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-8		ATT	What is a proprietary CR?	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-9		ATT	When are EDI draft worksheets available?	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-10		ATT	Have CLECs had input into the development of the change management processes?	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-11		ATT	Combined with CM-2.	Available For Future Use	NA
CM-12		WCom	WCom not allowed to vote on EDI CRs.	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-13			Scope of CICMP process	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-14			Whether Contents of Exhibit G should be included in SGAT	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-15			Whether Contents of Exhibit H should be included in SGAT	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-16			Distinguishing between issues that warrant consideration in CICMP form versus between individual Qwest/CLEC	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop

Attachment 9

QWEST'S COLORADO APPLICATION TO PROVIDE IN-REGION INTERLATA SERVICE
COLORADO PUC DOCKET NUMBER 97I-198T
Workshop No. 6 (1st Session)
Section 12, General Terms and Conditions, CICMP, BFR
June 19 – 22, 2001

Issue ID #	SGAT #	Party/ Source	Description of Issue	Action/ Status	Due Date
CM-17			Processes for notification of CLECs and adequacy of process.	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop
CM-18			Documents described and as yet unidentified or unknown, which include the change request prioritization process and other links.	Not Discussed	Discuss in July Workshop

Interim Exception Process for OSS Interfaces, Product and Process Changes

As of September 6, 2001

What is needed?

- Quick implementation
- Uniquely identified (e.g., Exception/Vote) on subject line
- Clearly communicated if vote is required with deadline and means (i.e., participate on call, meeting or via e-mail)
- Description of request
- Send to ALL CLECs
- Minutes to be released to all CLECs
- Regulatory Mandates and Third Party Testing requirements qualify
- Logistics of information call and voting meeting/call
- Material and agenda

Notification Timeline

- Qwest to announce at the CMP Meeting regarding the expedited change is needed
- Qwest to issue notice at least xxx days in advance of the informational call/meeting
- Hold informational call/meeting and write minutes
- Hold voting call/meeting and write minutes with voting results

Voting Process

- Majority Rules among total voting CLEC entity (via call, meeting or e-mail)
- If tie, notify all CLECs of the situation and schedule a second round of voting
- Matt Rossi or Mark Routh will schedule and conduct a voting call/meeting

NOTE: OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
13C	Action	August 7 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Provide location (link) where all notification documents are kept – Wholesale web site	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~August 14~~ Extended Sep 18	Jarby Blackmun shared proposed screen shots with Core Team on 9/5. Related to Items #13F, 37, 44, and 61.
13F	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Develop timeframe to roll-out web site and mail-out process	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~August 14~~ Extended Sep 18	Related to Items #13C, 37, 44, 61
13G	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Re-visit the redlined CMP framework element, "Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site" at a later working session.	Core Team	Sep 20	Re-visit this element to insure all items are addressed in the re-designed CMP framework.
17A	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Scope	Qwest expressed concern that the Scope needs further clarification. Qwest will propose language to re-visit the Scope at a future session.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	September 20	
24	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP POC List	Establish a CMP POC list (primary and alternate POC) and post on web site	Qwest— Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Oct 2	Response is quite slow from the CLEC community, therefore Qwest is calling and asking CLECs to respond with contact information. In addition, Qwest to publicize the need for POC information at the Qwest sponsored CLEC Forums.
37	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Investigate the possibility of housing all RNs, CRs and Training information in one location and providing multiple methods in which this information is accessed on the web site. Example, this can be a search by number or search by category	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	Jarby Blackmun to provide read-out of potential recommendations. Related to Items #13C, 13F, 44, 61

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
38	Issue	August 14 Meeting	Notifications	Identify designated owner or point of contact for the mail outs to contact with problems – example web sites listed with in-active URLs. 9/5: Is there flexibility in the process to support CLECs on notices (e.g., Help Desk, Sales Manager)?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 18	Qwest will continue to refer a CLEC to their respective Service Manager if there are questions pertaining to a notification. 9/5: CLECs need to work with their respective Service Manager, and if necessary, speak with the Service Manager's boss to clarify questions pertaining to a specific notice.
40	Issue	August 14 Meeting	Notifications	Are Call Center outages included in the "outages" sub-category – should they be?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	Provide status on Sep 18
42	Action	August 14 Meeting	Notification	Investigate how notifications are done for Network outages, including a paging broadcast capability.	Qwest – Jim Maher	~~Sep 6~~ Extended to Sep 18	Related to Item #66
44	Action	August 14 Meeting	Notification	Create instructions for access to web site notification	Qwest - Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	Related to Items #13C, 13F, 37, 61
49	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of changes – OBF V.1	Look at other industry bodies that need to be included in type 3 changes (e.g., ANSI and ATIS)	Core Team	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	
51	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of Changes – OBF V.1	Obtain SGAT language for versioning release language	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	
52	Action	August 16	OBF V. 1	Create language in OBF version 1	Qwest –	~~Sep 5~~	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
		Meeting		in Change to Existing Interfaces section VII. Also address 'defects.'	Judy Schultz	Extended to Sep 20	
53	Action	August 16 Meeting	Qwest CMP Process Document	Revise Qwest CMP process document to incorporate added language and proposed changes/improvements to the overall process to provide a basis for comparison and discussion with the CMP Re-Design Core Team.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	
60	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	CLEC Question-naire	Verify if there is an entry on the CLEC questionnaire for contact information (POC)	Qwest – Matt Rossi	Sep 18	Promote the importance for CLECs to provide accurate contact information at the Qwest sponsored CLEC Forum.
61	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Provide an Archive on the CMP web site.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	Sep 20	Related to Items #13C, 13F, 37, 44
62	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	Re-design Location	Provide location, directions and names of nearby hotels for Minneapolis meetings.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	Sep 10	
63	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	CMP Re-design	Provide examples at the Qwest sponsored Sep CLEC Forum of what has been changed as a result of the CMP re-design effort	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 13~~ To be re-scheduled	The Qwest sponsored CLEC Forum on September 12-13 was postponed due to the national crisis.
64	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	Monthly CMP Meeting	Allegiance to re-introduce a previously denied CR that is still needed so that Qwest can assess and CLECs to prioritize.	Qwest – Mark Routh	Sep 19	
65	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	Re-design Impasse	Obtain feedback from individual organizations on the draft proposed	Core Team	Sep 18	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
			Resolution Process	CLEC-Qwest Impasse Resolution Process for the re-design effort.			
66	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	271 Workshop SGAT	Qwest to make presentation regarding the SGAT language and how it relates to the process structured by the Core Team.	Qwest – Andy Crain	Sep 18	Including Item #42
67	Issue	Sep 6 Meeting	271 Workshop SGAT	Do exhibits G (CMP framework) and H (escalation process) need to be in the SGAT?	Core Team	Sep 18	Related to Item #66
68	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	271 Workshop 18 COIL Items	Review the 18 items and verify that they will be addressed in the CMP re-design	Core Team	On-going	
69	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	Qwest Status Report	Review red lined document and Qwest status report prior to scheduled filing.	Core Team	October 2	Andy Crain to provide documents
70	Issue	Sep 6 Meeting	CLEC Review of Tech Pubs and PCAT Changes	What is the process for CLECs to review and provide comments to notices on Tech Pub and PCAT changes – what is the role of the CMP group (monthly) in these proposed changes?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	Sep 18	Susie Bliss will provide overview of the process.
71	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	Production Support Process	What is the process for CLECs to report and Qwest to notify CLECs on production problems—what is the production support process and timeline? Where is the CLEC documentation pertaining to this information?	Qwest – Wendy Green	Sep 18	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
72	Issue	Sep 6 Meeting	CR Process	What is the process if the CLEC-originator does not agree with Qwest's reply or the CR is rejected?	Core Team	Sep 18	To be addressed in the discussion on the Escalation Process and the Dispute Resolution Process.
73	Issue	Sep 5 Meeting	Account Management	Clarify roles and responsibility of Service Managers and Sales Managers. What is the internal notification process (e.g., advanced notice before CLEC) for Service Managers on CLEC notices?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5 Extended to Sep 18~~ Extended to Oct 2 - 3	Subsequent to the Sep 5-6 session, Qwest requests to address this item at the Oct 2 or 3 meeting to allow the Service Management Director to participate in-person in Minneapolis.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

CLOSED ISSUES and ACTION ITEMS (items in BLUE were closed at the last working session)

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1A	Issue	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider Role	What role do 3rd Party Providers play in this re-design effort? a) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client [Process=Yes, Vote=No] b) 3rd Party Providers are allowed to 'voice' and 'vote' as any CLEC in this re-design effort [Process and Vote=Yes] c) 3rd Party Providers are excluded from the core team [Process and Vote=No] d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client with an LOA [Process=Yes, and Vote=Yes for CLEC client, Vote = No for themselves]	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process; however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client if a Letter of Authorization is in effect. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1B	Action	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider	Core Team to conclude discussion and participants to decide on one of the above scenarios	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED in July 19 meeting.
1C	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Can a CLEC represent another CLEC on Voting for CMP re-design process?	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: Yes, if a Letter of Authorization is in place for a specific session and on specific issues. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.
1D	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Voting	If a CLEC or core team member is absent, how do we handle the vote?	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: It is a CLEC's responsibility to have a same CLEC backup, or a LOA in place with an alternate.
1E	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Create a standard voting form	Qwest -- Mark Routh	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Voting form created and will be included in the draft meeting minutes for 8/7-8/8 session
1F	Action	July 19 Meeting	LOA	Create a standard for LOA for topic, meeting, and date to be used during the re-design sessions.	Qwest - Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: LOA presented, discussed and agreed upon during the 8/7 Meeting.
1G	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Define rules for a quorum when a 'vote' is required	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: - Quorum is defined as 51% of the present Core Team Members - Majority vote by present Core Team Members carries the decision

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1H	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Seek written permission from July 19 participants if 3rd Party Provider voting results can be posted on the web site as part of the FINAL meeting notes.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED August 16	Participating CLECs (SBC Telecom not available) provided permission for Qwest to include voting results as part of the FINAL 7/19 Meeting Minutes COMPLETED: SBC Telecom gives permission to publish its 7/19 voting result.
2	Action	July 11 Meeting	Baseline Document	Create a single document that inserts CLEC comments on areas for improvement in Qwest's CMP into the appropriate sections of the OBF 2233 version 2 framework	Judy Lee	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: A tool for the working session is posted on the web site
3	Action	July 11 Meeting	Agenda Items	Schedule agenda items/elements for future working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: See schedule of working sessions on the web site
4	Action	July 11 Meeting	Working Session Location	Decide the location for September working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: All sessions will be hosted by Qwest and held in Denver, CO
5	Action	July 11 Meeting	CMP Redesign Web Site	Enhance the CMP web site to include the CMP Redesign information	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED. See CMP web site for "CMP Redesign"
6	Issue	July 19 Meeting	CMP Redesign Material	What is the process to share CMP redesign material with the CLEC community?	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Draft minutes and material will be shared with the core team participants for input. Afterwards, Qwest will finalize the minutes and post on the web site. CLECs will be notified about the posting.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							DECISION: Participants decided that Qwest should issue a notice referring CLECs to the web site for meeting minutes, handouts and agenda for next meeting. The handouts will not be attached to the notice.
7A	Action	July 11 Meeting	Post CLEC Comments on Web Site	CLEC requested that Qwest post all CLEC comments on the CMP Re-design web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Matrix is posted on the web site
7B	Action	July 11 Meeting	Written Permission to Post CLEC Comments	Seek clearance in writing from individual CLECs to post their comments on the CMP Redesign web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 13	COMPLETED: CLECs that provided comments allowed Qwest to post on web site
8	Action	July 19 Meeting	Notice and Distribution Lists	Provide guidelines for CLEC notifications and distribution list - Ease-of-use - Comment/Reply process including web site option to comment - Contact information - Identify limitations on contact information: proprietary, open-to-participant, or open-to-all	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Established four categories for notices to facilitate notification efficiency.
9	Action	July 19 Meeting	Re-name	Do we need to rename ~~CMP to CMP~~ CMP to CMP? Rename co-provider to CLEC?	Core Team	CLOSED August 16	DECISION (7/19): Qwest will rename co-provider to CLEC and provider to Qwest. DECISION (8/7):

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							Recommendation to rename from CMP to CMP will be presented at 8/15 CMP Meeting DECISION: (8/15) CLECs agreed to change CMP to CMP
10	Action	July 19 Meeting	ATIS	Research what ASOG activities are being worked on at ATIS.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: ATIS is not developing a Change Management process that includes ASRs. Related to Issue #17B.
11A	Action	July 19 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	Determine what to include in the CMP meeting distribution packages.	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	COMPLETED: REDLINED CMP re-design framework will reflect results of discussion.
11B	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	Qwest to provide a sample of the "report" containing information for CMP meeting.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Judy Schultz presented example report and CLECs accepted the 'report' concept.
11C	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	CLECs have a need to see one document/report containing all information (single point of reference). For example, CR/RN Logs need to include originator, title, description, history and status, so that individual CRs and RNs do not need to be included in Monthly Meeting package. CRs also need to include actual response/s and	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: Rollout to CLEC community at the 9/19 Monthly CMP meeting. COMPLETED: Qwest presented mockup at the 9/5 re-design meeting.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				decision. Present a sample distribution package for review with updated tracking documents			
12	Action	July 19 Meeting	Walk-On Agenda Items	Add walk-on item to the end of each CMP meeting agenda.	Qwest—Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: Qwest will add walk-on items to the end of each agenda, as appropriate, starting with the August 15 meeting
13A	Action	July 19 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Review CMP web-site and suggest potential changes and guidelines	Core team	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Included in 8/8 redlined CMP framework
13B	Action	August 7 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Can Qwest display new naming convention on the CMP web site (CRs and RNs)—e.g., Ability to click category and receive next sub category?	Qwest – Judy Schultz/ Core Team	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Closed on proposals for sub-category under the 4 categories (Systems, Product, Process and Network). Qwest is able to display naming convention on web site
13D	Action	August 7 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add English title to all new and existing CRs posted on the CMP web site	Qwest – Mark Routh Matt Rossi	CLOSED 9/5	COMPLETED: Matt and Mark have updated the web sites to add the requested information.
13E	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Qwest to determine how to time-stamp each web site page (whenever the page is updated on the web site)	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Qwest is currently doing this today and will continue on all updated pages
14A	Action	July 19 Meeting	Notification Process	Discuss guidelines for the notification process at the next session.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Refer to re-worded Action #14C.
14B	Action	August 7	Notification	Explore functionality and	Qwest –	CLOSED	COMPLETED:

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
		Meeting	Process	capability of the "mail out" tool used for Product/ Process notifications.	Judy Schultz	August 8	"Mail-outs" are not on the web site—pending closure on the categories and sub-categories from Core Team (see Item #13B)
14C	Action	Updated August 7 Meeting (7/19)	Notification Process	Using proposed naming convention, build a matrix of possible combinations for RN titles.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: CLECs provided upgrades to Judy Schultz' proposal. As a result of this discussion, opened Item #14D
14D	Action	August 7 Meeting	Notification Process	Take existing system, product and process notification and modify to match proposed naming convention to obtain one single naming convention for all notifications	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: Qwest will adopt a single naming convention for notifications. Progress will be monitor at the Monthly CMP meetings.
14E	Issue	August 8 Meeting	Notification Process	What category (i.e., 4 category) should be used to notify CLECs of the introduction of a new product? Should Qwest send one notice addressing product and process, or two separate, but redundant notices (i.e., one for Product and another for Process but with the same content)?	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: Qwest to send a Product notice and a separate Process notice with the same content information—redundant notices with different category and name on the subject line.
14F	Action	August 8 Meeting	Notification Process	Provide proposals for sub-categories (e.g., Product Family) under each notice category (Systems, Product, Process and Network) and links.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Web Site modification rollout is dependent on proposal for sub-categories—see Item 14C. Presented and closed during 8/14 Re-Design meeting
16	Action	July 19	Qwest	Include Qwest comments on the	Qwest—	CLOSED	COMPLETED:

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
		Meeting	Comments on MATRIX	MATRIX (OBF Issue 2233 with CLEC Comments)	Judy Schultz	August 14	Included Qwest's proposal on the MATRIX.
15	Action	July 19 Meeting	Notice	Research source and readability of event notifications (software applications)	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: System outages and event notifications are now being released in a "doc" format.
17B	Issue	August 7 Meeting	Scope	Describe Qwest's position for systems and functionality supported in the current CMP process (i.e., EXACT, HEET)	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	August 14 discussion provided a definition for OSS Interfaces that includes system functionality.
17C	Action	August 7 Meeting	Scope	Dialogue on introduction and scope to seek input from CLECs to prepare for Qwest's proposal on September 20th	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: Qwest will provide proposal on Sep 20 for discussion.
18	Action	July 19 Meeting	PIDs	WorldCom will provide the Core Team members with the latest PIDs for Change Management.	WorldCom Liz Balvin	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Liz Balvin sent PIDs on July 20th
19	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Contact Information	Eschelon requested that contact information for all participant be included on the CMP Re-design web site	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Request from review of 7/19 DRAFT meeting notes and material COMPLETED: All contact information now included on the Re-Design page on the CMP web site
20	Action	July 19 Meeting	Discussion Items under Issues/ Action Item Log	Eschelon requests to include on the agenda topics for discussion under Issues and Action Items Log	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Request from review of 7/19 DRAFT meeting notes and material COMPLETED: Updated 8/7-8/8 agenda
21A	Action	August 7	Core Team	Establishing CMP Re-Design Core	Qwest –	CLOSED	COMPLETED:

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
		Meeting		Team Membership	Judy Schultz	August 7	Reviewed Core Team membership
21B	Action	August 7 Meeting	Core Team—Meeting Quorum	Establish Core Team Quorum at the beginning of each working session	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: Quorum determination will be added to the agenda and be determined by attendance at each working session
22	Issue	August 7 Meeting	Core Team—Expectations	Define Expectations of Core Team Membership	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: Core Team Expectations/ Responsibilities: - Dedicated resource to negotiate a new CMP process. - Core Team Members can be added at any time understanding the roles and responsibilities of a Core Team Member. - Core Team Members must commit to participate either in person, via conference call, or by LOA in each working session. - Core Team Membership will be revoked if 3 consecutive working sessions are missed. - Core Team member will not be allowed to vote on any issue in which they did not participate.
23	Action	August 7 Meeting	Upcoming Event Calendar	Provide an "up coming" events page on the CMP web site that includes all monthly meetings, re-design meetings and any other interim ad hoc meetings/calls	Qwest – Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Calendar is on the web site.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
25	Issue	August 8 Meeting	Quick Hit Fix	How should Qwest introduce some Change Management Process changes ahead of completing the re-design CMP effort?	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: Qwest will review any proposals with the CMP re-design Core Team members before communicating at a Monthly CMP Meeting. During the Monthly CMP Meeting, Qwest will let meeting attendees know who participated in designing the Quick Hit proposal. "Quick Hit Fix" will be a standing item for the Monthly CMP Meeting agenda.
26	Action	August 8 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Review	What is the timeline for DRAFT and FINAL 8/7-8/8 Meeting Minutes and material?	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: – DRAFT Meeting Minutes and materials (by Fri, 8/10 9am MT) – Distribute DRAFT to 8/7-8/8 re-design session participants for review (by Fri, 8/10 Noon MT) – Participants provide Matt Rossi with corrections/additions (Mon, 8/13 Noon MT) – FINAL Meeting Minutes and materials to be distributed and posted on CMP Re-design web site (by Tuesday, 8/14)
27	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Re-design Location	Determine location for the October, November and December re-design working session.	Core Team	CLOSED August 16	Qwest has tentatively reserved meeting rooms in Denver, Colorado

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							DECISION: (8/16) October sessions will be held in Minneapolis, except for CMP week; November and December sessions will be held in Denver
28	Action	August 8 Meeting	Monthly CMP Meeting	Move December meeting to 12/12	Qwest—Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED August 16	COMPLETED: Monthly CMP meeting is moved to 12/12.
29	Action	August 8 Meeting	Exception Process	Share other ILEC Exception Process with 8/14 working session participants to be used as a base.	Sprint—Sandy Evans	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Sprint and AT&T brought samples.
30	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add Meeting Agenda, material, dates to web site CMP category	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Began with August 14 and 16 meeting minutes
31	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Change category Ordering to Ordering/Provisioning and Repair to Repair/Maintenance	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
32	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add Raw Loop Data Tool to the IMA GUI section of web site categories for Systems	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
33	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add another sub-category of "Other" for systems with possible expansion later after re-visit of the scope discussion.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
34	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Investigate adding back end systems to the sub categories of the	Qwest—Judy	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				Systems notifications on the web site (WFA, TIRKS, etc)	Schultz		matrix.
35	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add "procedures" as a sub category (2) to the Process section	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: This is to include any joint procedures that involve both the CLEC and Qwest – e.g., repair and exchange of CLEC owned equipment
36	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add "Tariffs" as a main category in the proposed matrix	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
39	Issue	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Provide screen shots of the web site to give visual representation	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: See Jarby Blackmun's Qwest Wholesale CLEC "Notices On-Line" presentation, dated Sep 4, 2001 on the CMP Re-design web site.
41	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add the Re-Design page on the CMP section of the Proposed Release Notification matrix	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
43	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Investigate possibilities for displaying (posting) and sorting Sub-category 3 of the web site	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Jarby Blackmun informed the team that search capabilities will include category, sub-category and document number.
45	Action	August 14 Meeting	Voting Tally Form	Incorporate Qwest's position on the Voting Tally Form	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 16	See Procedures for A Vote and Impasse Resolution Process (includes Voting Tally Form) on

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							the CMP Re-design web site
46	Action	August 14 Meeting	Voting	Draft a proposal for a voting procedure and contingency dispute resolution process for dead-lock	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 16	See proposed Procedures for A Vote and Impasse Resolution Process (includes Voting Tally Form) on the CMP Re-design web site
48	Action	August 14 Meeting	Voting	Determine how to reach resolution within the CLEC community if impasse were to occur – present draft proposal	AT&T - Terry Bahner	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: CLECs will hold a conference call to achieve consensus to resolve an impasse issue.
50	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of Changes – OBF V.1	Present change request flow chart, form, and procedures for CR handling	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Flow chart of change request process was discussed with modifications. Qwest to make modifications (add Denied, Escalated, Deferred and Withdrawn) and present flow chart to the CLEC community at the Sep 19 Monthly CMP meeting.
54	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes	Add action item verbiage to the meeting minutes as opposed to referencing the action items document	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	Began with the August 14 and 16 meeting minutes
55	Action	August 16 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Review	What is the timeline for DRAFT and FINAL 8/14 and 8/16 Meeting Minutes and material?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: – DRAFT Meeting Minutes and materials (by ~~Tues, 8/21~~ Fri, 8/24) – Distribute DRAFT to 8/14 and 8/16 re-design participants for

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							review (by ~~Tues, 8/21~~ Fri, 8/24 COB) – Participants provide Mark Routh with corrections/additions (~~Thurs, 8/23~~ Tues, 8/28 COB) – FINAL Meeting Minutes and materials to be distributed and posted on CMP Re-design web site (by ~~Monday, 8/27~~ Fri, 8/31) Qwest extended timeline on 8/21.
56	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Update	Revise August 7-8 Final Meeting Minutes to: – Change "CLEC" to "Co-Provider" in the word CMP on page 3, paragraph 4 – Correct name to "Wicks" – Correct Evans-Sprint comments to "responses to CRs are sent to the originator via email, not posted on the web site."	Qwest—Jim Maher	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Refer to CMP Re-design web site for revised final meeting minutes.
57	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Update	Revise July 19 Final Meeting Minutes to include the voting results on the 3rd Party Provider issue—on August 14, the last voting CLEC has given Qwest permission to publish its result.	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 21	COMPLETED: Revised Final July 19 Meeting Minutes are posted on the CMP Re-design web site.
58	Action	August 14 Meeting	Core Team Expectations	Update the document to: "New Core Team member will not be	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 16	COMPLETED: Revised guidelines are posted on

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 12, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				allowed to reopen a vote on any issue that has been decided on."			the CMP Re-design web site.
59	Action	August 16 Meeting	OBF August, 2001 Framework	Share with the re-design team the results of OBF Issue 2233 subcommittee proposal—a2v2	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 21	COMPLETED: Sent via email to all re-design participants.

Attachment 12

TO: Qwest CMP Re-design Team

FROM: AT&T Redesign Members

Date: September 14, 2001

Re: Comments Concerning the September 5th and 6th Re-design Meetings

Several items came up at last week's Change Management Process re-design meeting that concern the AT&T team. Generally, we find that Qwest has been changing the rules of the game as this re-design has proceeded and that this must stop in order for Qwest and the CLECs to make any meaningful progress. We have identified some specific examples below.

1. Re-design Documentation. From early in this process, the CLECs and Qwest agreed that we would work from the OBF 2233 document and reflect changes made and other agreements reached in that document. We clarified at the August 14, 2001 meeting that the comments made in the version we were working from should be transferred to version 1 of the OBF 2233 document and brought to last week's meeting. That work was not done by the time we got to the meeting last week. Qwest brought a new document entitled "CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process" with the latest draft date of August 31, 2001, which we had never seen. It was apparent that Qwest expected CLECs to work from this August 31, 2001 document, which was not complete and the source of which is not clear. Moreover, this document reflected seven "draft" dates from 9/10/99 through 5/11/01. These are all dates that precede the CMP re-design and don't mean anything to AT&T.

AT&T's expectations are that: (a) this process will drive the preparation of complete documentation that thoroughly describes how CICMP will work, (b) the parties will proceed section by section through the OBF document to the greatest extent possible and (c) Qwest will prepare this documentation and distribute updated redlined copies of such documentation in advance of every re-design meeting so that CLECs have the opportunity for review prior to the next re-design meeting. It is AT&T's understanding that OBF 2233 v. 1 is the starting point for the preparation of the necessary documentation.

2. Re-design or Augmentation? At the re-design meeting this week, a Qwest person, whom we understand may be a Qwest witness in the 271 proceedings, attempted to "correct" everyone in attendance by stating that we are involved in an "augmentation" rather than a "re-design" of the change management process. This is curious since all of the minutes and other documentation generated by Qwest since this process began refers to "re-design." That tells us that Qwest is confused; not the CLECs. What we call it is perhaps not as important as what we are doing. So, from AT&T's perspective, we are in fact re-designing a process that is not collaborative, that takes too long, that is deficient,

and that does not work well. This is consistent with the comments CLECs provided to Qwest in July. Qwest, by engaging in this process, clearly acknowledges this. Please let us stick with the task at hand and not confuse the issue with unnecessary changes in terminology. AT&T will continue to refer to this process, and treat it, as a re-design. We will encourage other CLECs to do the same.

3. Following the Existing Process. Last week, Qwest called a meeting of a few CLECs (four, at most) to make a decision regarding an LNP issue in the Qwest product catalog. This was an issue that Qwest had not brought before the CLECs in the CMP via a change request, as is the current process. In addition, Qwest chose not to address this matter at a CMP meeting. Just the same, Qwest attempted to have the few CLECs who participated in this call vote, as if to make a binding decision for all CLECs regarding the PCAT changes. At that meeting, AT&T and Sprint clearly stated that they were not in a position to vote and expressed concern about the nature of the meeting. The fact is, Qwest went out of process to try to get a change to its PCAT approved by CLECs to serve a Qwest purpose. This has never been an option available for CLECs. When a CLEC wants to propose changes, it must submit a change request in the CMP. As Qwest knows, the same process requirement applies to Qwest. In response to Qwest's desire to define possible exceptions to the strict requirement to submit a CR, the CLECs and Qwest discussed an interim process for emergency situations. While we do not agree that the situation that arose last week fits into this category, we recognize there may be times when an emergency process may be appropriate.

4. Voting. At the very first meeting held on July 11, CLECs and Qwest agreed to the guiding principle: "One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules." This is reflected in the meeting minutes. On July 19, 2001, we conducted a vote regarding software vendors where each entity cast a single vote and the majority prevailed. Then at the August 7 meeting, July Lee wanted to "clarify" the voting. As far as the AT&T team was concerned, no clarification was needed. We understood just fine, until Ms. Lee "clarified" for everyone what Qwest meant: "One vote per corporate entity with majority rules in CLEC community and one vote for Qwest, making every effort to reach consensus." As far as AT&T is concerned, that was not a clarification, it was an outright change in the process. Apparently, even Mark Routh was confused because our attorneys have pointed out to us that in a Colorado PUC hearing, held on August 23, 2001, Mr. Routh stated under oath that CLECs each get a vote and that Qwest gets a vote with the majority prevailing. When asked the following question: "So if there are eight CLECs and then Qwest, there are nine votes and majority rules?"; he stated, "That's correct." You will note that this was sixteen days after the CMP re-design meeting where Ms. Lee made the "clarification."

Based on the changes in position we have observed since July 11, 2001, this team has to say that this process seems less collaborative as time goes on. We are losing confidence in Qwest's ability to meet it's commitments.

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
Tuesday, September 18 and Thursday, September 20, 2001 Working Session

1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304, pass code 7101617#

NOTE: These are DRAFT meeting minutes Qwest developed following the two day working session. Draft minutes will be circulated to the CMP Re-design Core Team Members in attendance with FINAL Meeting Minutes to be posted on the Wholesale CMP Re-design web site once updated with attendee revisions.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team (Team) and other participants met September 18 and 20 to continue with the redesign effort of the Change Management Process. Following is the write-up of the discussions, action items, and decisions made in the working session. The attachments to these meeting minutes are as follow-

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Attendance Record
- Attachment 2: September 18 and 20 Agenda
- Attachment 3: Updated September 20 Agenda
- Attachment 4: Issues and Action Items Log_September 18, 2001
- Attachment 5: Customer Letter Site Design, September 20, 2001
- Attachment 6: Qwest SGAT/CMP Draft
- Attachment 7: DRAFT—Procedures for Voting and Impasse Resolution Process for the CMP Re-design Working Sessions
- Attachment 8: Qwest Draft CMP Redlined Framework_09-18-01
- Attachment 9: Qwest Thursday, September 20 Dispute Resolution Proposal
- Attachment 10: Qwest Table of Contents-Issues List
- Attachment 11: Master Redlined CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Framework_Revised 09-18-01

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting began with introductions of the meeting attendees. Judy Lee reviewed the two day agenda and stated that she would be managing facilitation of the meeting tightly to help move the team through the agenda. She reviewed all agenda items and asked if there were any additions or deletions. There were no revisions from the attendees. Tom Dixon-WorldCom did ask if there were analog lines so that attendees could use their computers and reduce the need for paper copies and make individual document management more effective. Qwest responded that there were no analog lines in the conference room, and that analog lines were very limited in the building. Judy Lee then began to review the meeting materials that were developed by Qwest. Karen Clauson-Eschelon stated that the format of the Master red-lined document did not follow the format requested at the previous meeting. Terry Wicks-Allegiance agreed with Clauson's comments. Clauson explained that the Master Redline was to follow the OBF format. Jim Maher-Qwest stated that the request had been misunderstood, and that Qwest had used a Qwest developed Table of Contents that had been reviewed by the team at the Sept 6th session. Maher also stated that there was no Qwest language in the Master red-lined document as had been agreed to at the previous Re-design session. Judy Lee requested a subcommittee review the format of the document and that the corrections be submitted September 20th. The subcommittee was comprised of Liz Balvin-WorldCom, Karen Clauson-Eschelon, Jim Maher-Qwest, and Terry Wicks-Allegiance. This group agreed to meet and revise the documentation immediately following the September 18th meeting.

Judy Schultz-Qwest then began a review of the Escalation process, and stated Qwest had developed language that was included in the Re-Design team handout materials. Schultz went on to explain that Qwest had reviewed the requests of multiple CLECs, and that Qwest was prepared to establish a single point of contact for escalations. This would reduce to one level, the three levels of escalation currently in effect. Andy Crain-Qwest compared the Qwest proposal to the OBF documentation being used as a baseline by the Re-design team. Crain stated that the Qwest proposed escalation process was more streamlined, and reduced the total time of an escalation to 14 days from the 21 days that would occur if the escalation went through the three levels outlined in the OBF document. Larry Gindlesberger-Covad asked about the additional 7 days that Qwest referred to in their language. Judy Schultz-Qwest explained that this language was meant to indicate that once Qwest had delivered the escalation response to the CLEC, and Qwest received no response from the CLEC within 7 days the escalation would be considered closed. Tom Dixon-WorldCom stated that the there were two items that needed clarification; one being that the Qwest escalation language stated that escalations should fall within CMP Scope and Scope had not been defined, and that based on Escalation Cycle language he assumed that all escalation progress would be posted on the Qwest "Escalation" website. Terry Wicks-Allegiance agreed with Dixon that he thought Qwest would maintain a separate "Escalation" website within CMP. Dixon-WorldCom then stated that the Qwest representative replying to the escalation have the authority to "bind" Qwest to the escalation response. Dixon went on to ask whether Qwest would discontinue activities associated with the escalation while the escalation was in progress. Dixon stated that the CLEC community should want to determine how Qwest move forward during an escalation. Andy Crain-Qwest stated that an escalation may apply to many issues, and that an escalation could raise issues that have been going on for years. Crain stated he didn't know how Qwest could stay an action related to an escalation. Dixon then stated that this situation might involve the Exception Process. Dixon stated that the language didn't need to be crafted now, but there should be a placeholder identified to resolve this concept. Dixon stated that details need to be developed outlining when and why an activity should be stopped. Liz Balvin-WorldCom asked if escalation issues could pertain to CMP itself. Discussion then moved to the difference between the Qwest proposed escalation language, and the Master red-lined language. Balvin expressed concern that an escalation could start only after the CMP is followed. She pointed out that a CR minimum timeframe is 24 business days and that would slow down an escalation. Becky Quintana-Colorado PUC asked if Qwest was envisioning that changes to CMP would be through the CR process, and that the CR process had to be followed prior to an escalation. Mitch Menezes-ATT asked how ongoing performance issues were to be addressed. Schultz-Qwest stated that the escalation process for CMP was not meant to manage ongoing performance or production issues. Schultz stated those issues are to be escalated through their applicable processes. Discussion then moved to Qwest proposed language that stated the escalation would occur after making "every attempt to resolve an issue in good faith". Clauson-Eschelon stated that this added a step to the escalation process. Bill Littler-Integra reiterated that "good faith" language was not required and that an escalation is extremely time sensitive. Mark Routh-Qwest stated that the good faith language was meant to help define the issue, and not to be another step. Clauson reiterated that the language did result in an additional step, and the "good faith" language implies that something else occurs before the escalation. Schultz-Qwest stated that the "good faith" language was not meant to add another step, but to ensure that the parties worked together to resolve differences and to ensure that the escalation process was not used to circumvent CMP. Clauson-Eschelon stated that rather than using the "good faith" language in the escalation section, it should be incorporated in another section of the CMP documentation being developed by the team. Dixon-WorldCom agreed that the "good faith" language needed to be covered in a general section of the CMP document, where it would have broader implications to all CMP. Dixon recommended striking the good faith language from the escalation section. Discussion then moved to comparing the escalation language in the Qwest proposal to the language in the Master redline (OBF). Dixon-WorldCom stated WorldCom was pleased with striking the three levels that are covered in the Master redline. Dixon stated that the Qwest language proposed assigning the escalation to a Qwest Director, and that WorldCom did not care what level Qwest assigned the escalation to as long as the Qwest representative could bind the resolution to Qwest. Menezes-ATT asked if the language should state CLEC peer to Qwest peer. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest would not want to use peer to peer language because the CLECs had previously requested a single pointof contact into Qwest.

Additionally, Qwest proposed a director level escalation owner because a Qwest Director would understand that the escalation response was binding when other Qwest employees might not. Discussion then followed regarding modifications to the escalation language in the Master redline. Matt Rossi-Qwest made the modifications to the Master redline as the discussion took place (See Attachment 11). Sandy Evans-Sprint stated that 14 days for escalation resolution was too long. Schultz-Qwest stated the 14 days represented a 7 day reduction from both the existing Qwest escalation process and from the OBF guidelines. Balvin-Worldcom and Clauson-Eschelon both agreed that this was an improvement but that the 14 days was too long. Crain-Qwest stated that while Qwest had reduced the levels for escalation and made them transparent to the CLEC, the escalation could still involve the same steps and levels to determine a binding commitment. Crain stated that escalations usually involved numerous Qwest functions, and that escalation decisions were usually complex and could require the 14 days. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest would not use the 14 days for every escalation, and would provide a response as soon as the escalation was resolved. She stated the 14 days was the maximum amount of time for an escalation response. Dixon-WorldCom asked if Qwest could explore changing the 14 day interval to 7 days. Judy Schultz-Qwest agreed to take an action item to come back with an escalation timeframe. Crain-Qwest stated that any "binding" language agreed to by Qwest, would be reciprocal to the CLECs. Dixon-WorldCom agreed that "binding" language applies to CLECs as well as to Qwest. Lynne Powers-Eschelon asked how CLECs would be notified of escalations. Megan Doberneck-Covad asked if Qwest could provide a notification of the escalation and responses through the mailout process. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest would send out a notice to all CLECs for each escalation. Terry Wicks-Allegiance asked at what point other CLECs could be brought into the escalation, particularly if the escalation open and close date was between the CMP monthly meeting. Powers-Eschelon agreed with Wicks that Qwest needs to include CLECs in escalation discussions so the escalating CLEC has the support of other interested CLECs. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest was willing to address how to keep other CLECs notified and involved in escalations.

Andy Crain-Qwest began a review of the Qwest proposed language for dispute resolution. Crain explained that the BellSouth dispute resolution language had been used as a baseline, and that dispute resolution should follow an escalation to Qwest. Discussion then turned to the language and the language "any affected CLEC". Mike Hydock-ATT asked for the definition of "any affected CLEC". Terry Wicks-Allegiance stated that Allegiance may want to initiate a dispute resolution but may not be considered an "affected CLEC". Becky Quintana-Colorado PUC asked how the Commission would handle "any affected CLEC". She asked if that meant that only the CLEC who initiated the escalation could bring the issue into the dispute resolution process. Crain-Qwest stated that the term "affected" would be modified to "participating". Dixon-WorldCom stated there was no language developed in the escalation process by the team that identified "participating CLEC". The team agreed to readdress escalation and language was inserted into the Master redline regarding "participating CLEC". Discussion then moved to the requirement that a dispute resolution can only be initiated if a CLEC has escalated the issue. Dixon-WorldCom asked how this could be applied if the CLEC was not involved in the escalation resolution. Discussion then followed on dispute resolution, and it was determined that the language that Qwest submitted should be reworded and submitted to the team at the Sept 20th meeting. Crain-Qwest agreed to provide reworded language on Sept 20th. The team then addressed Attachment 7, "Procedures for voting and impasse". The attachment indicates the changes that were made to that document.

Andy Crain-Qwest then reviewed regulatory procedures that were to occur with the Colorado Commission. Crain stated that a status report would be filed with the Commission on October 10th, and that Qwest would file with its SGAT the CMP document in its current state on November 30th. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the Re-design schedule was very aggressive and asked what was to be filed. Crain stated that Qwest was committed to filing the document as it was. Clauson stated that before Nov 30th the team needed to discuss the main issues with product/process since these issues had not addressed those at this point, and she did not understand how the information could be filed since the Re-design effort had not addressed so many issues. Becky Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that the requirement to file the CMP documentation had come from the Colorado Commission, and not from Qwest. Bill Littler-Integra expressed concern that Qwest has developed documentation that has not been discussed in the Re-

design meetings, and he was concerned Qwest might file Qwest developed language. Crain explained that Qwest will file the CMP document as it exists at the time, but that Qwest will explain which sections had been discussed in the Re-design sessions. Crain committed that he would bring in language that would be included in the SGAT.

On Sept 20th the meeting opened with a review by Judy Lee of the handouts that were e-mailed to the attendees. Discussion then moved to the SGAT language modifications that Andy Crain had made (See Attachment 6). Crain explained that he had added revised language that explained how the CMP is a living document. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Qwest should not represent the language as agreed to language and that there were concerns with the wording. Mitch Menezes-ATT agreed that the language was not reflective of what the team understood CMP to include. Sharon VanMeter-ATT stated the language had an overarching systems focus, but CMP was to involve much more than that. Menezes-ATT stated that the language should include, at a minimum, what the team thought was encompassed by CMP. Crain-Qwest stated that Qwest would not represent the language as agreed upon. Crain stated that since product/process CMP had not been addressed by the Re-design team, other ILECs such as SBC could be used as the working models for product/process CMP. Crain asked if there were any other ILECs that had product/process in place. Larry Gindlesberger-Covad stated that Verizon West has a product/process CMP in place, and that he would try and get a copy to the group. Mana Jennings-Fader-Colorado PUC asked how product/process changes were implemented through CMP. Crain-Qwest stated that in SBC if the product/process change is CLEC impacting there is a 30 day notification process. Jennings-Fader asked why product/process changes that impacted CLECs were allowed to go in effect without CLEC review and comments. She also stated that tech pubs include substantive information that has an impact to CLECs, and it is not clear how they have input to those changes. Crain stated that the product/process CMP provisions Qwest was reviewing included notification processes that worked for companies like SBC. Jennings-Fader asked how Qwest could implement product/process changes if the CLECs disagreed with the changes. Clauson-Eschelon questioned how Crain could describe processes that had not been discussed or decided on. She stated that she agreed with Jennings-Fader and that changes should not be implemented if the CLECs don't agree to them. Megan Doberneck-Covad stated that throughout the CMP documentation the term "CLEC affecting" was used and there was no good definition of "CLEC affecting". Doberneck also stated that the term "available to CLECs" and that there were many product and processes not available to CLECs that should be included in CMP. Mitch Menezes-ATT stated that there was an instance of an internal document Qwest used for collocation that had a big impact on CLEC operations but that it was not "available" to the CLECs. Judy Schultz-Qwest asked if the discussion that had taken place for the past hour could be taken off-line by the attorneys since it involved mainly the attorneys and was a legal discussion. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the discussion went to the heart of operational issues, and that the legal issues discussed were closely tied to operational issues. Sharon Van Meter-ATT stated that although she was an operations representative from ATT that she needed to understand legal implications of issues the Re-design team was addressing. Bill Littler-Integra stated that even though there were just a couple of CLECs very actively involved in the discussion that silence should be understood as concurrence with the statements made by the CLECs. Van Meter-ATT agreed with Littler and stated that unless a CLEC stated disagreement, they were in agreement with what was said by other CLECs. Van Meter and Littler stated that Karen Clauson-Eschelon has more experience with some of the issues and that they agreed with her statements. Tom Dixon-WorldCom stated that the discussion was dependent on finalizing Scope of CMP and then SGAT language could be crafted. Donna Osborne-Miller-ATT stated that from the discussion it was evident that scope needed to be addressed and resolved first. Crain-Qwest stated that Qwest would make the agreed-upon changes to the SGAT CMP language and that Qwest is willing to readdress the language later in the process. Crain explained that the CMP document as it has been developed by the Re-design team as of November 30th would become Exhibit G.

The next item was a presentation of the proposed CMP website design by Jarby Blackmun-Qwest. Blackmun reviewed Attachment 5, and went through the drop down menus that could be developed. Blackmun stated that a live demo was available and was posted on the CMP Re-design site under presentations. Terry Wicks-Allegiance stated that the design looked great, and the team agreed.

Blackmun stated that the goal was to have the website up and running by the first of November. Discussion then continued regarding how CRs are managed and Matt Rossi-Qwest stated that CRs are managed on their own website. Liz Balvin-WorldCom asked how a notification relating to a CR would be referenced. Rossi-Qwest stated that any notification that is a direct result of a CR would be included with other information pertaining to that CR in the CR database.

Jim Maher-Qwest then reviewed the results of the meeting with Clauson-Eschelon, Balvin-WorldCom and Wicks-Allegiance. Maher reviewed the format of the Master Redline (Attachment 11) and the Qwest draft CMP Redlined Framework (Attachment 8). The Master redline is based on the OBF document from Dec 2000, and can only be modified in Re-design session. The Qwest draft contains Qwest proposed language that can be reviewed by the Re-design team for inclusion in the Master Redline. Maher-Qwest also stated that Qwest had e-mailed the earlier versions of the redlines used in the Re-design session since the Re-design team had changed the OBF document used in the July 19th, and August 8th session to the earlier OBF document in the Aug 14th and 16th session. Earlier versions were sent so all members could confirm that the revisions had been correctly captured by Qwest in the Master redline presented Sept 20th.

Andy Crain-Qwest then presented the revisions to the Dispute Resolution language submitted at the Sept 18th Re-design meeting. Wicks-Allegiance asked why the escalation language was required since there may be times when the Dispute Resolution process is followed because the CLEC realizes that the Qwest position has already reached the executive levels at Qwest. The escalation language was removed. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the language concerning an agreement to use ADR was fine. All parties agreed with the changes to the Dispute Resolution language developed by the team. (See Attachment 11, Master Redline).

The team then discussed Draft-Procedures for Voting and Impasse Resolution for Re-design. (See Attachment 7) Larry Gindlesberger-Covad asked how impasse resolution was going to work after 271. Crain-Qwest stated that the team needed to address mechanisms for filing impasse issues with the state commissions. Megan Doberneck-Covad asked how 14 state commissions with potentially different rulings would be incorporated into CMP which is a regionwide process. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the language being reviewed was on page 2 but that the language above needed to be considered. Becky Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that it was up to the facilitator to declare an impasse. Mitch Menezes-ATT questioned why the parties had to agree with an impasse. He continued that there should be some period of time so that issues are not left open indefinitely. Clauson-Eschelon stated that there was language that stated how many meetings could pass before the Impasse Process was invoked. The parties agreed upon revisions to Attachment 7 which resolved the issues regarding dispute resolution.

Judy Lee then began the afternoon session with a review of the Qwest language developed for Introduction and Scope. Liz Balvin-WorldCom asked for the definition of local services. Jim Maher-Qwest stated that the term "local services" was meant to distinguish that other wholesale services such as Access Services (ASOG) were not included. Judy Schultz-Qwest stated that the term "indirectly impacting" was too broad and Qwest could not support that language. Karen Clauson-Eschelon stated that there could be back end systems that indirectly impact the CLECs and that those systems should be included in CMP. Schultz-Qwest asked if the footnote defining "OSS interface" developed by the team was sufficient. Clauson-Eschelon stated Eschelon had asked that a specific Qwest center handle port-in and port-out changes and that Eschelon wanted to specify how the CR was implemented. Jeff Thompson-Qwest responded that the CLEC can request functionality on the CR, but Qwest reserves the right to determine how that functionality is delivered. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Eschelon had been unsuccessful in the past in getting a solution from Qwest for this issue, and that Eschelon was told that Qwest training would occur to solve the problem but that the problem had not been solved. Thompson-Qwest stated that the CLEC can request functions that should be implemented to support LSR processing, but it was up to Qwest to develop the solution. Clauson-Eschelon then asked how CLECs can request a system such as InfoBuddy that is available to Qwest retail centers. Thompson-Qwest stated that Qwest couldn't commit to a CLEC initiated CR that specifies a certain solution, and that it was

the functionality that Qwest could implement. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Qwest can not block a CR, and that CLECs should be able to request and comment on how solutions should be implemented. Judy Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest would not turn down CRs requesting specific solutions, but would work with the CR originator to define functionality to be delivered. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the CLECs do not want to be precluded from requesting certain items. Liz Balvin-WorldCom stated that the OSS interface footnote stated "provided to the CLECs", and that the footnote was limiting. Terry Wicks-Allegiance stated that indirectly was broad. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the term indirectly was needed because after ROC Qwest could make changes to systems which advantage Qwest. Judy Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest recognizes its parity obligations, nut that CMP is not the appropriate forum to address parity issues. Schultz stated there are other processes in place to address parity issues. Beth Woodcock-Qwest concurred with Schultz. Balvin-WorldCom stated that it is CMP that should be addressing parity issues, and the CLECs needed the same functionality made available to Qwest. Clauson-Eschelon stated that CLECs would not know about retail system changes if parity were not included in scope. Becky Quintana-Colorado PUC asked that when ROC TAG goes away where parity discrimination issues would be discussed and addressed. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that retail systems do affect CLECs offering resale. Terry Bahner-ATT stated that back end systems do affect LNP and that CLECs should be able to request modifications to those back end systems. Bahner stated Qwest was identifying some of the back end systems in Qwest notifications. Clauson-Eschelon stated that "CLEC impacting" is nice as a theory but the reality was that there were many changes Qwest made that would not be defined as "CLEC impacting" that affected the CLECs business. Wicks-Allegiance stated that the CLECs don't want to find out parity issues on their own, and that the CLECs don't know what systems are available to retail. Tom Dixon-WorldCom stated that the retail parity issue may be declared as an impasse. Dixon-WorldCom stated when 271 is over the CLECs have no way of determining parity issues and that Qwest needs to board the process that would be used. Clauson-Eschelon stated that this was another example of why scope needed to be defined. Wicks-Allegiance proposed that the next meeting of the Re-design team be dedicated to scope and introduction. Wicks went on to say if scope could not be resolved and agreed to at the next meeting it would be declared at impasse. Schultz-Qwest asked if the CLECs could submit recommended scope language by Sept 27th. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Qwest could develop scope language that indicates what is NOT covered in CMP. Mitch Menezes-ATT stated that Becky Quintana's question regarding how parity is addressed was at the heart of the issue regarding scope. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that scope should include how the Qwest retail group communicates with the Qwest wholesale group.

The discussion then turned to the Master Redline (Attachment 11) and the section addressing types of changes. The language from the Qwest draft (Attachment 8) was also referenced. Jeff Thompson-Qwest stated that the reason Qwest wanted Production Support removed from types of changes was because production support changes are handled through the trouble ticketing and not through change management. Clauson-Eschelon stated that production support needed to be captured in the CMP document and asked if that was why Qwest had recommended it become Section 12 in the Qwest Table of Contents-Issue List (See Attachment 10). Sandy Evans-Sprint stated that she would like the severity levels maintained. Thompson-Qwest stated that Qwest does have developed severity levels and that those would be provided to the Re-design team and should be used in the CMP document. Tom Dixon-WorldCom stated that the Qwest introductory paragraph that had the term "CLEC impacting" was tied to scope and could not be defined. The group then reviewed Regulatory and Contractual Changes. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she had concerns with contract obligations falling under regulatory changes. Clauson stated that Qwest could enter into any contract knowing that they were agreeing to changes that could be classified as regulatory, and that those changes would take precedence over CLEC originated requests. Becky Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that when an ICA complaint was brought to the Commission that the decision should be considered a Regulatory Change. The team then reviewed Industry Guideline Change, Qwest Originated Change, and CLEC Originated Change. The language was changed in the Master Redline based on the input from the team.

The team then addressed the CR Initiation Process section. Karen Clauson-Eschelon stated that the clarification meetings had not been defined. Judy Schultz-Qwest asked the team how they wanted

clarification calls to be managed since, based on CLEC comments made during the monthly CMP meeting, it appeared there was a difference of opinion between the CLECs. Terry Wicks-Allegiance stated that the CR clarification call should be handled with the originator, and that the CR response review call should be available to all CLECs. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the team was learning as we were going along, and that the underlying goal was that CLECs would understand the CR and should be included in the clarification call. She said the CLECs expect to hear about the CRs at the monthly meetings, and that at the monthly meeting the CRs needed to be reviewed. Judy Schultz-Qwest responded that she was willing to include all CLECs in the clarification call, and that a written response would be provided to the originator. Clauson-Eschelon stated that all CLECs needed to be notified regarding the response right away. There was discussion regarding whether the CLEC originator should decide if an additional clarification call with other CLECs is required, or an additional call is required after Qwest issues the CR response. Sandy Evans-Sprint stated that Sprint wants the option to hold an additional call once the response is received. Bill Littler-Integra stated that the CLEC CR originator should decide if another call is required. It was determined that a subteam would review that steps in CR Initiation and Response and come back to the team with a recommendation. The team would be comprised of Judy Schultz-Qwest, Jim Beers-Qwest, Liz Balvin-WorldCom, Karen Clauson-Eschelon, Donna Osborne-Miller-ATT, and Terry Wicks-Allegiance.

The team then discussed future meeting schedules.
The new schedule for the remaining CMP Re-design Working Sessions as agreed upon September 20:

October 2 and 3
October 16
October 30, 31 and November 1
November 13
November 27, 28, 29
December 10 and 11

In addition, this is the proposed schedule for the upcoming general monthly CMP meetings with a two-day format. Do note that Qwest needs to send a notice to the larger CLEC community.

Product/Process	**OSS Interfaces**
October 17	October 18
November 14	November 15
December 12	December 13

Judy Lee began boarding the agenda items for systems and for product/process for the scheduled CMP Re-design sessions, and Tom Dixon-WorldCom stated that since Lee was developing the agendas she should submit them to the Re-design team for review and approval. There was no disagreement from the team, and the meeting ended.

Attachment 1

Attendance Record

Core Team Members

9/18	9/20	Company	Last Name	First Name	Email	Phone	Comments
x	x	Allegiance Telecom	Wicks	Terry	terry.wicks@algx.com	469-259-4438	
x	x	AT&T	Bahner	Terry	Tbahner@att.com	303-298-6149	
x	x	AT&T	Osborne-Miller	Donna	dosborne@att.com	303-298-6178	
x	x	AT&T	Van Meter	Sharon	svanmeter@att.com	303-298-6178	
%		Avista	Thiessen	Jim	jthiessen@avistacom.net	509-444-4089	
%	%	Covad Communications	Gindlesberger	Larry	Lgindles@covad.com	330-209-5499	
		Electric Light Wave	Gunderson	Peder	peder_gunderson@eli.net	360-816-3429	
%	%	Eschelon Telecom	Clauson	Karen	klclauson@eschelon.com	612-436-6026	
%		Eschelon Telecom	Powers	Lynne	flpowers@eschelon.com	612-436-6642	
		Eschelon Telecom	Stichter	Kathy	klstichter@eschelon.com	612-436-6022	
%	%	Integra	Littler	Bill	blittler@integratelecom.com	503-793-5923	
		McLeod	Sprague	Michelle	msprague@mcleodusa.com	319-790-7402	
		Qwest	Green	Wendy	Wteepe@qwest.com	303-382-8124	
x	x	Qwest	Maher	Jim	Jxmaher@qwest.com	303-896-5637	Scribe
x	x	Qwest	Rossi	Matt	mrossi@uswest.com	303-896-5432	
x	x	Qwest	Routh	Mark	mrouth@uswest.com	303-896-3781	
x	x	Qwest	Schultz	Judy	jmschu4@qwest.com	303-965-3725	
	x	Qwest	Thompson	Jeff	jlthomp@qwest.com	303-896-7276	
	%	SBC Telecom	Lees	Marcia	Marcia.lees@sbc.com	314-340-1131	
		Scindo Networks	DeGarlais	Vince	vcedegarlais@scindonetworks.com	720-528-4207	
		Scindo Networks	Gavrilis	George	Gtgavrilis@scindonetworks.com	720-528-4193	
%	%	Sprint	Evans	Sandy	sandra.k.evans@mail.sprint.com	913-433-8499	
x	x	WorldCom	Balvin	Liz	liz.balvin@wcom.com	303-217-7305	
x	x	WorldCom	Hines	LeiLani	LeiLani.Jean.Hines@wcom.com	303 217-7340	

Attendance Record

Other Participants

9/18	9/20	Company	Last Name	First Name	Email	Phone	Comments
		Accenture	Powell	Mark			
x		AT&T	Hydock	Mike	mkydock@att.com	303-298-6653	
		AT&T	McCue	Bill		Pager 888-858-7243 pin 108884	
x	x	AT&T	Menezes	Mitch	mmenezes@att.com	303-298-6493	
		CapGemini	Ferris	Robyn			
	x	Colorado PUC	Jennings-Fader	Mana	mana.jennings@state.co.us	303-866-5267	
x	x	Colorado PUC	Quintana	Becky	Becky.Quintana@dora.state.co.us	303-894-2881	
x	x	Covad Communications	Doberneck	Megan	mdoberne@covad.com	720-208-3636	
		KPMG Consulting	Nobs	Christian	cnobs@kpmg.com	415-831-1323	
%	%	KPMG Consulting	Yeung	Shun (Sam)	shunyeung@kpmg.com	212-954-6351	
x	x	Qwest	Bisgard	Jeff			
	x	Qwest	Blackmun	Jarby			presentation
x	x	Qwest	Crain	Andy			
		Qwest	LeMon	Lynne	Llemon@qwest.com	303-965-6321	
x	x	Qwest	McDaniel	Paul	prmcdan@qwest.com		
x	x	Qwest	Woodcock	Beth	woode@perkincoie.com		
		Telcordia	Thompson	Nancy			
x	x	WorldCom	Dixon	Tom	Thomas.f.Dixon@wcom.com	303-390-6206	
x	x	WorldCom	Travis	Susan	susan.a.travis@wcom.com	303-390-6845	

Facilitator

x	x	XTel Solutions, Inc.	Lee	Judy	soytofu@pacbell.net	650-743-8597	

Attachment 2

Working Session to Negotiate A Modified Change Management Process
Tuesday, September 18, 2001 (10 am to 5 pm Mountain Time) and
Thursday, September 20, 2001 (9 am to 5 pm Mountain Time)
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304 passcode: 7101617 (hit #)

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18
AGENDA

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction (10 am – 10:15 am MT)	Judy Schultz, Qwest
• Review Core Team Membership	
• Review Agenda	Judy Lee, Facilitator
Discussion and Status (10:15 am – 4:30 pm MT) (including Break and working lunch)	All

- Review and Discuss (10:15am – Noon)
  – Escalation Process and Dispute Resolution Process (Action #72)

- Pick-up Lunch (Noon to 12:30pm)

- Issues and Action Items: (12:30pm – 3pm)
  – Core Team input on CMP Re-design Impasse Resolution Process (Action #65)
  – SGAT (Action #66, 67, 42)
    - SGAT language pertaining to CMP framework and how it relates to the process structured by the CMP Re-design Core Team
    - Do exhibits G (CMP framework) and H (escalation process) need to be in the SGAT?
    - Operational procedures for Network outage notification
  – Redlined Framework re-visited items
    - Review structure of Master Redlined format
    - #13G: Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site
    - #17A: Introduction and Scope
  – What is the CLEC notification process if there is a Call Center outage? (Action #40)
  – What is the process for CLECs to review and provide comments on Tech Pub and PCAT changes? And what is the role of the CMP Monthly group in these proposed changes? (Action #70, 73)
  – Others (Actions #60, 62, 63, 64, 71)
- Feedback on Final August 14 and 16 Meeting Minutes
- Status on Final September 5 and 6 Meeting Minutes

Next Session (4:30 pm to 4:50 pm MT) All
- Determine discussion items for September 20
- Determine what supporting material is needed for the session

Closing Remarks (4:50 pm to 5 pm MT) Judy Schultz

Adjourn

Working Session to Negotiate A Modified Change Management Process
Tuesday, September 18 (10 am to 5 pm Mountain Time) and
Thursday, September 20, 2001 (9 am to 5 pm Mountain Time)
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304 passcode: 7101617 (hit #)

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 20
AGENDA

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction (9 am – 9:15 am MT) • Review Core Team Membership • Review Agenda	Judy Schultz, Qwest Judy Lee, Facilitator
Discussion and Status (9:15 am – 4 pm MT) (including Break and 1-hour lunch)	All

- Issues and Action Items (from Sep 18 meeting)
  - Status on Web Site and Notification (Action #13C, 13F, 37, 44, 61)
- Review and Discuss
  - Change Request Initiation Process
  - Type of Changes
  - Change to An Existing OSS Interface
    - Application-to-Application
    - Graphical User Interface
  - OSS Interface Prioritization
  - Exception

Next Session (4 pm – 4:30 pm MT) • Determine discussion items for the next working session • Determine what supporting material is needed for the next session	All
Quick Fix Implementation (4:30 pm – 4:45 pm MT)	Judy Schultz
Closing Remarks (4:45 pm - 5 pm MT)	Judy Schultz
Adjourn	

Working Session to Negotiate A Modified Change Management Process
Thursday, September 20, 2001 (8 am to 4 pm Mountain Time)
1801 California Street, 23rd Floor, Executive Conference Room, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 1-877-847-0304 passcode: 7101617 (hit #)

Updated AGENDA

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction (8 am – 8:30 am MT)	Judy Schultz, Qwest
• Review Core Team Membership	
• Review Agenda	Judy Lee, Facilitator
Discussion and Status (8:30 am – 3:30 pm MT)	All

- Issues and Action Items
  - **8:30 am to 9 am:** Status on Web Site and Notification (Action #13C, 13F, 37, 44, 61)—Jarby Blackmun
  - **9 am – 9:30 am:** SGAT (Action #66, 67, 42)—Andy Crain
    - SGAT language pertaining to CMP framework and how it relates to the process structured by the CMP Re-design Core Team
    - Do exhibits G (CMP framework) and H (escalation process) need to be in the SGAT?
    - Operational procedures for Network outage notification
  - **9:30am to 10:30 am:**
    - Dispute Resolution Process for the overall Change Management Process
    - Dispute Resolution Process for the CMP Re-design Effort
  - **10:30 am – Noon:** Redlined Framework re-visited items
    - Review structure of Master Redlined format—Jim Maher
    - #13G: Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site
    - #17A: Introduction and Scope

- **Noon to 12:30 pm: Lunch**
- **12:30 pm to 3:30 pm:** Review and Discuss
  - Change Request Initiation Process
  - Type of Changes
  - Change to An Existing OSS Interface
    - Application-to-Application
    - Graphical User Interface
  - Prioritization of OSS Interface Change Requests
  - Exception Process

Next Session (3:30 pm – 4 pm MT)	All
• Establish the CMP elements for future working sessions	
• Determine discussion items for the next working session	
• Determine what supporting material is needed for the next session	
Closing Remarks	Judy Schultz
Adjourn	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
13C	Action	August 7 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Provide location (link) where all notification documents are kept – Wholesale web site	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~August 14~~ Extended ~~Sep 18~~ Sep 20	Jarby Blackmun shared proposed screen shots with Core Team on 9/5. Related to Items #13F, 37, 44, and 61.
13F	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Develop timeframe to roll-out web site and mail-out process	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~August 14~~ Extended ~~Sep 18~~ Sep 20	Related to Items #13C, 37, 44, 61
13G	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Re-visit the redlined CMP framework element, "Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site" at a later working session.	Core Team	Sep 20	Re-visit this element to insure all items are addressed in the re-designed CMP framework.
17A	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Scope	Qwest expressed concern that the Scope needs further clarification. Qwest will propose language to re-visit the Scope at a future session.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	September 20	
24	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP POC List	Establish a CMP POC list (primary and alternate POC) and post on web site	Qwest— Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Oct 2	Response is quite slow from the CLEC community, therefore Qwest is calling and asking CLECs to respond with contact information. In addition, Qwest to publicize the need for POC information at the Qwest sponsored CLEC Forums.
37	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Investigate the possibility of housing all RNs, CRs and Training information in one location and providing multiple methods in which this information is accessed on the web site. Example, this can be a search by number or search by	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	Jarby Blackmun to provide read-out of potential recommendations. Related to Items #13C, 13F, 44, 61

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				category			
38	Issue	August 14 Meeting	Notifications	Identify designated owner or point of contact for the mail outs to contact with problems – example web sites listed with in-active URLs. 9/5: Is there flexibility in the process to support CLECs on notices (e.g., Help Desk, Sales Manager)?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to ~~Sep 18~~ Oct 3	Qwest will continue to refer a CLEC to their respective Service Manager if there are questions pertaining to a notification. 9/5: CLECs need to work with their respective Service Manager, and if necessary, speak with the Service Manager's boss to clarify questions pertaining to a specific notice. 9/18: Toni Dubuque will join Oct 3 session to discuss
40	Issue	August 14 Meeting	Notifications	Are Call Center outages included in the "outages" sub-category – should they be?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to ~~Sep 20~~ Oct 15	Qwest will provide notice on the process via mail-out
42	Action	August 14 Meeting	Notification	Investigate how notifications are done for Network outages, including a paging broadcast capability. 9/5: Does the SGAT language pertaining to method of notification for Network outages need to revised based on Qwest practice?	Qwest – Jim Maher	~~Sep 6~~ Extended to ~~Sep 18~~ Sep 20	Related to Item #66
44	Action	August 14 Meeting	Notification	Create instructions for access to web site notification	Qwest - Judy	~~Sep 5~~ Extended	Related to Items #13C, 13F, 37, 61

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
					Schultz	to Sep 20	
49	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of changes – OBF V.1	Look at other industry bodies that need to be included in type 3 changes (e.g., ANSI and ATIS)	Core Team	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	
51	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of Changes – OBF V.1	Obtain SGAT language for versioning release language	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	
52	Action	August 16 Meeting	OBF V. 1	Create language in OBF version 1 in Change to Existing Interfaces section VII. Also address 'defects.'	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	
53	Action	August 16 Meeting	Qwest CMP Process Document	Revise Qwest CMP process document to incorporate added language and proposed changes/improvements to the overall process to provide a basis for comparison and discussion with the CMP Re-Design Core Team.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5~~ Extended to Sep 20	
60	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	CLEC Question-naire	Verify if there is an entry on the CLEC questionnaire for contact information (POC)	Qwest – Matt Rossi	~~Sep 18~~ Extended to Oct 2	Promote the importance for CLECs to provide accurate contact information at the Qwest sponsored CLEC Forum.
63	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	CMP Re-design	Provide examples at the Qwest sponsored Sep CLEC Forum of what has been changed as a result of the CMP re-design effort	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 13~~ To be re-scheduled	The Qwest sponsored CLEC Forum on September 12-13 was postponed due to the national crisis. This needs to be scheduled around the CMP re-design and monthly

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							CMP meetings
65	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	Re-design Impasse Resolution Process	Obtain feedback from individual organizations on the draft proposed CLEC-Qwest Impasse Resolution Process for the re-design effort.	Core Team	~~Sep 18~~ Extended to Sep 20	
66	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	271 Workshop SGAT	Qwest to make presentation regarding the SGAT language and how it relates to the process structured by the Core Team.	Qwest – Andy Crain	~~Sep 18~~ Extended to Sep 20	Including Item #42
67	Issue	Sep 6 Meeting	271 Workshop SGAT	Do exhibits G (CMP framework) and H (escalation process) need to be in the SGAT?	Core Team	~~Sep 18~~ Extended to Sep 20	Related to Item #66
68	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	271 Workshop 18 COIL Items	Review the 18 items and verify that they will be addressed in the CMP re-design	Core Team	On-going	
69	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	Qwest Status Report	Review red lined document and Qwest status report prior to scheduled filing. 9/18: Qwest to provide documents to participants no later than Sep 27 for review.	Core Team	October 2	Andy Crain to distribute documents no later than Sep 27 for re-design team review prior to Oct 2 meeting.
70	Issue	Sep 6 Meeting	CLEC Review of Tech Pubs and PCAT Changes	What is Qwest's proposal for CLECs to review and provide comments to notices on Tech Pub and PCAT changes – what is the role of the CMP group (monthly) in these proposed changes?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 18~~ Extended 9/20	Susie Bliss will provide overview of the process at the Sep 19 CMP product/process meeting. Defer until discussion on Scope is scheduled.
72	Issue	Sep 6 Meeting	CR Process	What is the process if the CLEC-originator does not agree with Qwest's reply or the CR is rejected?	Core Team	~~Sep 18~~ Extended 9/20	To be addressed in the discussion on the Escalation Process and the Dispute Resolution Process.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
73	Issue	Sep 5 Meeting	Account Management	Clarify roles and responsibility of Service Managers and Sales Managers. What is the internal notification process (e.g., advanced notice before CLEC) for Service Managers on CLEC notices?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	~~Sep 5 Extended to Sep 18~~ Extended to Oct 3	Subsequent to the Sep 5-6 session, Qwest requests to address this item at the Oct 3 meeting to allow the Service Management Director to participate in-person in Minneapolis.
74	Issue	Sep 5 Meeting	CR Process Dispute	What is the process if the CLEC-originator does not agree with reply or rejected CR	Core Team	Oct 2	Defer to discussion on the CR Process and Escalation and Dispute Resolution Process
75	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Redlined Framework	Review the Red-lined working document for successive working sessions	Bahner, Clauson, Maher, Wicks	Sep 18	Jim Maher to restructure the MASTER REDLINED CMP Re-design Framework
76	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation URL	Create URL for Escalated issues to be submitted	Judy Schultz	To be determined	Should include issue and proposed solution
78	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation Posting on Web Site	What is a reasonable time frame for posting an escalation issue and response (e.g., within one business day)?	Judy Schultz	Sep 20	Language under Escalation
79	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation Mail-out	Can a mail-out process be established for Escalated items (issue and response)?	Judy Schultz	Sep 20	
80	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation	Draft proposed language regarding time frames for Qwest to provide binding position on an escalated issue (e.g., 7 or 14	Judy Schultz	Sep 20	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				calendar days). Also include binding authority language.			
81	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation	During "14-day" response cycle, will Qwest continue efforts (e.g., CR) or will activity stop?	Judy Schultz	Sep 20	Requestor may ask that activity stop or continue.
82	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation	How are CLECs notified that an issue has been escalated between monthly CMP meeting?	Core Team	Sep 20	
83	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Dispute Resolution	Does an issue have to go through the escalation process before it is goes through the dispute resolution process?	Core Team	Sep 20?	
84	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Dispute Resolution	Propose language around dispute resolution ADR process. Do we want to sight specific organizations??	Andy Crain and CLEC Attorneys	Sep 20	
85	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Dispute Resolution	What is the process for CLEC-CLEC consensus and the Dispute Resolution Process?	Core Team	Sep 20	
86	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Dispute Resolution	When can Qwest invoke the Dispute Resolution Process?	Andy Crain	Sep 20	
87	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Re-design Impasse Resolution	Propose language around the CMP re-design impasse resolution process/dispute	Andy Crain	Sep 20	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				resolution process/dispute resolution process.			
88	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	CMP Process	Propose language for "proprietary CR"	Judy Schultz	Sep 20	
89	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	CMP Process	What is the process for a CLEC-originated CR deemed proprietary?	Core Team	Oct 3	
91	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Introduction and Scope	Define "good faith" and "normal CMP process" (3.4.1)	Core Team	Sep 20	
92	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	CR Process	Include in the CR Process a step for CLECs to discuss the CR after clarification process and before prioritization.	Core Team	Sep 20	
93	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Exception Process	What is the process for an Exception item during prioritization?	Core Team	Sep 20	

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

CLOSED ISSUES and ACTION ITEMS (items in BLUE were closed at the last working session)

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1A	Issue	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider Role	What role do 3rd Party Providers play in this re-design effort? a) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves or the CLEC-client [Process=Yes, Vote=No] b) 3rd Party Providers are allowed to 'voice' and 'vote' as any CLEC in this re-design effort [Process and Vote=Yes] c) 3rd Party Providers are excluded from the core team [Process and Vote=No] d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process, however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client with an LOA [Process=Yes, and Vote=Yes for CLEC client, Vote = No for themselves]	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: d) 3rd Party Providers are part of the core team to re-design the process; however no 'voting' rights on behalf of themselves, but can vote on behalf of the CLEC client if a Letter of Authorization is in effect. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1B	Action	July 11 Meeting	3rd Party Provider	Core Team to conclude discussion and participants to decide on one of the above scenarios	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED in July 19 meeting.
1C	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Can a CLEC represent another CLEC on Voting for CMP re-design process?	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: Yes, if a Letter of Authorization is in place for a specific session and on specific issues. The LOA must be provided to Judy Schultz.
1D	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Voting	If a CLEC or core team member is absent, how do we handle the vote?	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: It is a CLEC's responsibility to have a same CLEC backup, or a LOA in place with an alternate.
1E	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Create a standard voting form	Qwest -- Mark Routh	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Voting form created and will be included in the draft meeting minutes for 8/7-8/8 session
1F	Action	July 19 Meeting	LOA	Create a standard for LOA for topic, meeting, and date to be used during the re-design sessions.	Qwest - Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: LOA presented, discussed and agreed upon during the 8/7 Meeting.
1G	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Define rules for a quorum when a 'vote' is required	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: - Quorum is defined as 51% of the present Core Team Members - Majority vote by present Core Team Members carries the decision

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
1H	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Seek written permission from July 19 participants if 3rd Party Provider voting results can be posted on the web site as part of the FINAL meeting notes.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED August 16	Participating CLECs (SBC Telecom not available) provided permission for Qwest to include voting results as part of the FINAL 7/19 Meeting Minutes COMPLETED: SBC Telecom gives permission to publish its 7/19 voting result.
2	Action	July 11 Meeting	Baseline Document	Create a single document that inserts CLEC comments on areas for improvement in Qwest's CMP into the appropriate sections of the OBF 2233 version 2 framework	Judy Lee	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: A tool for the working session is posted on the web site
3	Action	July 11 Meeting	Agenda Items	Schedule agenda items/elements for future working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: See schedule of working sessions on the web site
4	Action	July 11 Meeting	Working Session Location	Decide the location for September working sessions	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: All sessions will be hosted by Qwest and held in Denver, CO
5	Action	July 11 Meeting	CMP Redesign Web Site	Enhance the CMP web site to include the CMP Redesign information	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED. See CMP web site for "CMP Redesign"
6	Issue	July 19 Meeting	CMP Redesign Material	What is the process to share CMP redesign material with the CLEC community?	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Draft minutes and material will be shared with the core team participants for input. Afterwards,

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							Qwest will finalize the minutes and post on the web site. CLECs will be notified about the posting. DECISION: Participants decided that Qwest should issue a notice referring CLECs to the web site for meeting minutes, handouts and agenda for next meeting. The handouts will not be attached to the notice.
7A	Action	July 11 Meeting	Post CLEC Comments on Web Site	CLEC requested that Qwest post all CLEC comments on the CMP Re-design web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Matrix is posted on the web site
7B	Action	July 11 Meeting	Written Permission to Post CLEC Comments	Seek clearance in writing from individual CLECs to post their comments on the CMP Redesign web site.	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED July 13	COMPLETED: CLECs that provided comments allowed Qwest to post on web site
8	Action	July 19 Meeting	Notice and Distribution Lists	Provide guidelines for CLEC notifications and distribution list - Ease-of-use - Comment/Reply process including web site option to comment - Contact information - Identify limitations on contact information: proprietary, open-to-participant, or open-to-all	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Established four categories for notices to facilitate notification efficiency.
9	Action	July 19	Re-name	Do we need to rename ~~CMP to~~	Core Team	CLOSED	DECISION (7/19):

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
		Meeting		~~CMP~~ CMP to CMP? Rename co-provider to CLEC?		August 16	Qwest will rename co-provider to CLEC and provider to Qwest. DECISION (8/7): Recommendation to rename from CMP to CMP will be presented at 8/15 CMP Meeting DECISION: (8/15) CLECs agreed to change CMP to CMP
10	Action	July 19 Meeting	ATIS	Research what ASOG activities are being worked on at ATIS.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: ATIS is not developing a Change Management process that includes ASRs. Related to Issue #17B.
11A	Action	July 19 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	Determine what to include in the CMP meeting distribution packages.	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	COMPLETED: REDLINED CMP re-design framework will reflect results of discussion.
11B	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	Qwest to provide a sample of the "report" containing information for CMP meeting.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Judy Schultz presented example report and CLECs accepted the 'report' concept.
11C	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Meeting Distribution Package	CLECs have a need to see one document/report containing all information (single point of reference). For example, CR/RN Logs need to include originator, title, description, history and	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: Rollout to CLEC community at the 9/19 Monthly CMP meeting. COMPLETED: Qwest presented mockup at the 9/5

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				status, so that individual CRs and RNs do not need to be included in Monthly Meeting package. CRs also need to include actual response/s and decision. Present a sample distribution package for review with updated tracking documents			re-design meeting.
12	Action	July 19 Meeting	Walk-On Agenda Items	Add walk-on item to the end of each CMP meeting agenda.	Qwest—Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED July 19	DECISION: Qwest will add walk-on items to the end of each agenda, as appropriate, starting with the August 15 meeting
13A	Action	July 19 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Review CMP web-site and suggest potential changes and guidelines	Core team	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Included in 8/8 redlined CMP framework
13B	Action	August 7 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Can Qwest display new naming convention on the CMP web site (CRs and RNs)—e.g., Ability to click category and receive next sub category?	Qwest – Judy Schultz/ Core Team	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Closed on proposals for sub-category under the 4 categories (Systems, Product, Process and Network). Qwest is able to display naming convention on web site
13D	Action	August 7 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add English title to all new and existing CRs posted on the CMP web site	Qwest – Mark Routh Matt Rossi	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Matt and Mark have updated the web sites to add the requested information.
13E	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Qwest to determine how to time-stamp each web site page	Qwest—Judy	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Qwest is currently doing this today

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				(whenever the page is updated on the web site)	Schultz		and will continue on all updated pages
14A	Action	July 19 Meeting	Notification Process	Discuss guidelines for the notification process at the next session.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Refer to re-worded Action #14C.
14B	Action	August 7 Meeting	Notification Process	Explore functionality and capability of the "mail out" tool used for Product/ Process notifications.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 8	COMPLETED: "Mail-outs" are not on the web site—pending closure on the categories and sub-categories from Core Team (see Item #13B)
14C	Action	Updated August 7 Meeting (7/19)	Notification Process	Using proposed naming convention, build a matrix of possible combinations for RN titles.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: CLECs provided upgrades to Judy Schultz' proposal. As a result of this discussion, opened Item #14D
14D	Action	August 7 Meeting	Notification Process	Take existing system, product and process notification and modify to match proposed naming convention to obtain one single naming convention for all notifications	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: Qwest will adopt a single naming convention for notifications. Progress will be monitor at the Monthly CMP meetings.
14E	Issue	August 8 Meeting	Notification Process	What category (i.e., 4 category) should be used to notify CLECs of the introduction of a new product? Should Qwest send one notice addressing product and process, or two separate, but redundant notices	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: Qwest to send a Product notice and a separate Process notice with the same content information—redundant notices with different category and name on the subject

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				(i.e., one for Product and another for Process but with the same content)?			line.
14F	Action	August 8 Meeting	Notification Process	Provide proposals for sub-categories (e.g., Product Family) under each notice category (Systems, Product, Process and Network) and links.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Web Site modification rollout is dependent on proposal for sub-categories—see Item 14C. Presented and closed during 8/14 Re-Design meeting
16	Action	July 19 Meeting	Qwest Comments on MATRIX	Include Qwest comments on the MATRIX (OBF Issue 2233 with CLEC Comments)	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Included Qwest's proposal on the MATRIX.
15	Action	July 19 Meeting	Notice	Research source and readability of event notifications (software applications)	Qwest—Mark Routh	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: System outages and event notifications are now being released in a "doc" format.
17B	Issue	August 7 Meeting	Scope	Describe Qwest's position for systems and functionality supported in the current CMP process (i.e., EXACT, HEET)	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	August 14 discussion provided a definition for OSS Interfaces that includes system functionality.
17C	Action	August 7 Meeting	Scope	Dialogue on introduction and scope to seek input from CLECs to prepare for Qwest's proposal on September 20th	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: Qwest will provide proposal on Sep 20 for discussion.
18	Action	July 19 Meeting	PIDs	WorldCom will provide the Core Team members with the latest PIDs for Change Management.	WorldCom Liz Balvin	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Liz Balvin sent PIDs on July 20th
19	Issue	July 19	Contact	Eschelon requested that	Qwest—	CLOSED	Request from review of 7/19

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
		Meeting	Information	contact information for all participant be included on the CMP Re-design web site	Judy Schultz	August 7	DRAFT meeting notes and material COMPLETED: All contact information now included on the Re-Design page on the CMP web site
20	Action	July 19 Meeting	Discussion Items under Issues/ Action Item Log	Eschelon requests to include on the agenda topics for discussion under Issues and Action Items Log	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	Request from review of 7/19 DRAFT meeting notes and material COMPLETED: Updated 8/7-8/8 agenda
21A	Action	August 7 Meeting	Core Team	Establishing CMP Re-Design Core Team Membership	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Reviewed Core Team membership
21B	Action	August 7 Meeting	Core Team—Meeting Quorum	Establish Core Team Quorum at the beginning of each working session	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: Quorum determination will be added to the agenda and be determined by attendance at each working session
22	Issue	August 7 Meeting	Core Team—Expectations	Define Expectations of Core Team Membership	Core Team	CLOSED August 7	DECISION: Core Team Expectations/ Responsibilities: - Dedicated resource to negotiate a new CMP process. - Core Team Members can be added at any time understanding the roles and responsibilities of a Core Team Member.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							- Core Team Members must commit to participate either in person, via conference call, or by LOA in each working session. - Core Team Membership will be revoked if 3 consecutive working sessions are missed. - Core Team member will not be allowed to vote on any issue in which they did not participate.
23	Action	August 7 Meeting	Upcoming Event Calendar	Provide an "up coming" events page on the CMP web site that includes all monthly meetings, re-design meetings and any other interim ad hoc meetings/calls	Qwest – Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Calendar is on the web site.
25	Issue	August 8 Meeting	Quick Hit Fix	How should Qwest introduce some Change Management Process changes ahead of completing the re-design CMP effort?	Core Team	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: Qwest will review any proposals with the CMP re-design Core Team members before communicating at a Monthly CMP Meeting. During the Monthly CMP Meeting, Qwest will let meeting attendees know who participated in designing the Quick Hit proposal. "Quick Hit Fix" will be a standing item for the Monthly CMP Meeting agenda.
26	Action	August 8 Meeting	Meeting Minutes	What is the timeline for DRAFT and FINAL 8/7-	Qwest—Judy	CLOSED August 8	DECISION: – DRAFT Meeting Minutes and

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
			Review	8/8 Meeting Minutes and material?	Schultz		materials (by Fri, 8/10 9am MT) – Distribute DRAFT to 8/7-8/8 re-design session participants for review (by Fri, 8/10 Noon MT) – Participants provide Matt Rossi with corrections/additions (Mon, 8/13 Noon MT) – FINAL Meeting Minutes and materials to be distributed and posted on CMP Re-design web site (by Tuesday, 8/14)
27	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Re-design Location	Determine location for the October, November and December re-design working session.	Core Team	CLOSED August 16	Qwest has tentatively reserved meeting rooms in Denver, Colorado DECISION: (8/16) October sessions will be held in Minneapolis, except for CMP week; November and December sessions will be held in Denver
28	Action	August 8 Meeting	Monthly CMP Meeting	Move December meeting to 12/12	Qwest—Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED August 16	COMPLETED: Monthly CMP meeting is moved to 12/12.
29	Action	August 8 Meeting	Exception Process	Share other ILEC Exception Process with 8/14 working session participants to be used as a base.	Sprint—Sandy Evans	CLOSED August 14	COMPLETED: Sprint and AT&T brought samples.
30	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add Meeting Agenda, material, dates to web site CMP category	Qwest—Judy	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Began with August 14 and 16

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
					Schultz		meeting minutes
31	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Change category Ordering to Ordering/Provisioning and Repair to Repair/Maintenance	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
32	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add Raw Loop Data Tool to the IMA GUI section of web site categories for Systems	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
33	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add another sub-category of "Other" for systems with possible expansion later after re-visit of the scope discussion.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
34	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Investigate adding back end systems to the sub categories of the Systems notifications on the web site (WFA, TIRKS, etc)	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
35	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add "procedures" as a sub category (2) to the Process section	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: This is to include any joint procedures that involve both the CLEC and Qwest – e.g., repair and exchange of CLEC owned equipment
36	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add "Tariffs" as a main category in the proposed matrix	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
39	Issue	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Provide screen shots of the web site to give visual representation	Qwest – Judy	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: See Jarby Blackmun's Qwest

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
					Schultz		Wholesale CLEC "Notices On-Line" presentation, dated Sep 4, 2001 on the CMP Re-design web site.
41	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add the Re-Design page on the CMP section of the Proposed Release Notification matrix	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
43	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Investigate possibilities for displaying (posting) and sorting Sub-category 3 of the web site	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Jarby Blackmun informed the team that search capabilities will include category, sub-category and document number.
45	Action	August 14 Meeting	Voting Tally Form	Incorporate Qwest's position on the Voting Tally Form	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED August 16	See Procedures for A Vote and Impasse Resolution Process (includes Voting Tally Form) on the CMP Re-design web site
46	Action	August 14 Meeting	Voting	Draft a proposal for a voting procedure and contingency dispute resolution process for dead-lock	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 16	See proposed Procedures for A Vote and Impasse Resolution Process (includes Voting Tally Form) on the CMP Re-design web site
48	Action	August 14 Meeting	Voting	Determine how to reach resolution within the CLEC community if impasse were to occur – present draft proposal	AT&T - Terry Bahner	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: CLECs will hold a conference call to achieve consensus to resolve an impasse issue.
50	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of Changes – OBF V.1	Present change request flow chart, form, and procedures for CR handling	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Flow chart of change request process was discussed with modifications. Qwest to make modifications (add Denied, Escalated, Deferred and

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							Withdrawn) and present flow chart to the CLEC community at the Sep 19 Monthly CMP meeting.
54	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes	Add action item verbiage to the meeting minutes as opposed to referencing the action items document	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	Began with the August 14 and 16 meeting minutes
55	Action	August 16 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Review	What is the timeline for DRAFT and FINAL 8/14 and 8/16 Meeting Minutes and material?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: – DRAFT Meeting Minutes and materials (by ~~Tues, 8/21~~ Fri, 8/24) – Distribute DRAFT to 8/14 and 8/16 re-design participants for review (by ~~Tues, 8/21~~ Fri, 8/24 COB) – Participants provide Mark Routh with corrections/additions (~~Thurs, 8/23~~ Tues, 8/28 COB) – FINAL Meeting Minutes and materials to be distributed and posted on CMP Re-design web site (by ~~Monday, 8/27~~ Fri, 8/31) Qwest extended timeline on 8/21.
56	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Update	Revise August 7-8 Final Meeting Minutes to: – Change "CLEC" to "Co-Provider" in the word CMP on page 3, paragraph 4 – Correct name to "Wicks"	Qwest— Jim Maher	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Refer to CMP Re-design web site for revised final meeting minutes.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				– Correct Evans-Sprint comments to "responses to CRs are sent to the originator via email, not posted on the web site."			
57	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Update	Revise July 19 Final Meeting Minutes to include the voting results on the 3rd Party Provider issue—on August 14, the last voting CLEC has given Qwest permission to publish its result.	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 21	COMPLETED: Revised Final July 19 Meeting Minutes are posted on the CMP Re-design web site.
58	Action	August 14 Meeting	Core Team Expectations	Update the document to: "New Core Team member will not be allowed to reopen a vote on any issue that has been decided on."	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 16	COMPLETED: Revised guidelines are posted on the CMP Re-design web site.
59	Action	August 16 Meeting	OBF August, 2001 Framework	Share with the re-design team the results of OBF Issue 2233 subcommittee proposal—a2v2	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 21	COMPLETED: Sent via email to all re-design participants.
61	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Provide an Archive on the CMP web site.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 18	COMPLETED: Archive will remain on the CMP web site
62	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	Re-design Location	Provide location, directions and names of nearby hotels for	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 10	COMPLETED: Information provided to all CMP re-design participants

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—CLOSED

Revised—September 18, 2001

#	Issue/ Action	Originator	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				Minneapolis meetings.			
64	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	Denied Change Request	Allegiance to re-introduce a previously denied CR that is still needed so that Qwest can assess and CLECs to prioritize.	Qwest – Mark Routh	CLOSED Sep18	DECISION: Closed as an action item for the re-design effort, but tracked on the OSS Interface CMP action item list
71	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	Production Support Process	What is the current process for CLECs to report and Qwest to notify CLECs on production problems—what is the production support process and timeline? Where is the CLEC documentation pertaining to this information?	Qwest – Wendy Green	CLOSED Sep 18	COMPLETED: Notification distributed and posted by Tina Hubis on Sep10. Defer to Scope and Section 12 Production Support discussions according to the re-design schedule
90		Sep 18 Meeting	Network outage notification	Distribute notification of CLEC questionnaire with Network Outage notification option for pager notification.	Matt Rossi	CLOSED Sep 18	DECISION: An action item for the monthly CMP Product/Process

Customer Letter Site Design_September 20, 2001

"Customer Letter Site Design_Sep

12.2.6 Change Management(Language proposed Sept 20)

Qwest agrees to maintain a change management process, known as the Change Management Process (CMP), that is consistent with industry guidelines, standards and practices. Qwest and CLEC shall participate in discussions of OSS development in CMP. The CMP shall: (i) provide a forum for CLEC and Qwest to discuss CLEC and Qwest change requests (CR), release notifications (RN), systems release life cycles, and communications; (ii) provide a forum for CLECs as an industry to discuss and prioritize CLEC-initiated and Qwest-initiated CRs; (iii) develop a mechanism to track and monitor CRs and RNs; and (iv) establish communication intervals where appropriate in the process. Qwest will inform CLECs through the CMP of modifications to the structure of existing products available to CLECs, introduction of new products available to CLECs, discontinuance of products available to CLECs, modifications to pre-ordering, ordering/provisioning, maintenance/repair or billing processes which change CLEC operating procedures, introduction of pre-ordering, ordering/provisioning, maintenance/repair or billing processes which change CLEC operating procedures, discontinuance of pre-ordering, ordering/provisioning, maintenance/repair or billing processes which change CLEC operating procedures, modifications to existing OSS interfaces, introduction of new OSS interfaces, and retirement of existing OSS interfaces. Qwest will seek CLEC input on the planned changes and will report such consideration in a timely manner. Qwest will maintain an escalation process so that CMP issues can be escalated to a Qwest representative authorized to make a final decision and a process for resolution of disputes. The governing document for CMP, known as the "CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process" is attached as Exhibit G. . As of the date of filing, the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process document (Exhibit G) is the subject of ongoing negotiations between Qwest and CLECs in the ongoing CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process. Not all of the sections of Exhibit G have been discussed or considered during the ongoing CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process, and the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process document will be continue to be changed through those discussions. Exhibit G reflects the commitments Qwest has made regarding maintaining its CMP as of the date of filing, and Qwest commits to implement agreements made in the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process as soon as practicable after they are made. Following the completion of the CLEC-Qwest Change Management process, Exhibit G will be subject to change through the CMP process. Qwest will maintain the most current version of the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process document on its wholesale website ~~Exhibit G is subject to revision through the Change Management Process.~~

12.2.6.1 In the course of establishing operational ready system interfaces between Qwest and CLEC to support local service delivery, CLEC and Qwest may need to define and implement system interface specifications that are supplemental to existing standards. CLEC and Qwest will submit such specifications to the appropriate standards committee and will work towards their acceptance as standards.

12.2.6.2 Release updates will be implemented pursuant to the Change Management Process set forth in Exhibit G.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

Revised DRAFT on ~~9/6/2001~~ 9-20-01

Procedures for Voting and the Impasse Resolution Process

Introduction

During the CLEC-Qwest working sessions to negotiate improvements to Qwest's Change Management Process ("CMP"), collaborative discussions will be held to achieve agreement on the process. Qwest and the CLEC participants will negotiate in good faith and will meet the goal of modifying Qwest's current Change Management Process. Participants at a working session will determine if there are any issues requiring a vote at the next working session. If there is an issue requiring a vote, the agenda for the next working session will reflect the item. In addition, the agenda will be distributed to the CLECs and posted on the CICMP Re-design web site a week in advance of the session. A CLEC may authorize another CLEC or a 3rd Party Software Provider through a Letter of Authorization ("LOA") to represent its position on a specific issue at a specific working session. (A generic LOA is posted on the CICMP Re-design web site.)

The Guiding Principles for the working session states that there is

> *One vote per Corporate Entity with majority rules in the CLEC community and one vote for Qwest, making every effort to reach consensus.*

CLEC Participants To Achieve A Single Position On An Issue

- CLEC Participants will make every effort to reach consensus of an issue
- If there is a dead-lock within the CLEC participants:
  - A sidebar collaborative discussion will be held among CLECs to achieve a single position (Qwest is not present)—During the sidebar meeting, a CLEC may invoke a 'vote' among the CLEC participants to allow each participant to record his/her Company's position. At the same time, a CLEC participant may wish to abstain from placing a vote. (Refer to section on Voting Tally Form.)
  - If there is a dead-lock, the CLEC participants will bring the scenarios back to the working session with Qwest to further discuss, or request to table.
  - CLEC-Qwest will collectively agree to table the decision until the next scheduled working session ('freeze period') to allow CLEC participants to hold collaborative discussions off-line to achieve one position.
  - If there is an impasse after the 'freeze period,' the CLEC participants will exercise the Impasse Resolution Process (CLEC-CLEC Impasse).

CLEC-Qwest To Achieve A Single Position On An Issue

- CLEC participants and Qwest will make every attempt to reach consensus on an issue
- If there is a dead-lock between the CLEC community and Qwest:
  - A collaborative discussion will be held to achieve consensus on one position
  - If still in a dead-lock, the issue will be tabled until the next scheduled working session to allow each party to work the issue off-line
  - If the CLEC community and Qwest are still in a dead-lock at the subsequent working session after another round of discussions, the Impasse Resolution Process will be invoked. (Refer to section on CLEC-Qwest Impasse Resolution Process)

Impasse Resolution Process

- CLEC-CLEC Impasse Process
  - CLEC Core Team members will hold conference call with subject matter experts to resolve dispute.
  - A designated CLEC spokesperson will provide the entire Core Team (including Qwest) with the CLEC solution to the disputed issue.
- CLEC-Qwest Impasse Process
  - CLEC and Qwest will table (second round of tabling) until the next scheduled working session to work with stakeholders and respective leadership team to achieve one position for the impasse issue
  - Another round of collaborative discussions will continue at the third subsequent working session to close on the issue
  - If still in a dead-lock, the CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Dispute Resolution Process will be executed.

CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Dispute Resolution Process—(Action Item #65)

The CLEC participants and Qwest CMP representatives will make every attempt to resolve the issue through collaborative discussions and using the Impasse Resolution Process. However, if the result of the Impasse Resolution Process remains in an impasse ~~dead-lock, the CLEC participants and Qwest must agree that the issue is in an impasse. Upon this agreement between CLEC and Qwest participants,~~ there are two options to resolve this specific issue. And they are:

- Qwest will file monthly status reports regarding this process in its 271 proceedings, including in Colorado, Washington, Arizona, Nebraska, Oregon, the 7-State Process, Minnesota and South Dakota. Qwest will identify any current impasse issues in those reports, or CLECs may identify impasse issues in their comments on the reports, to be treated as impasse issues in the 271 process. If Qwest fails to file a monthly status report, a CLEC may submit the impasse issue to the commission to be treated as impasse issues in the 271 process.

- Following the date upon which a commission no longer accepts the impasse issues in a 271 proceeding, Qwest or any CLEC may submit the issue following the commission's established procedures with the appropriate regulatory agency requesting resolution of the dispute. This provision is not intended to change the scope of any regulatory agency's authority with regard to Qwest or the CLECs.

- ~~**Regulatory Body**: If agreed upon by the CLEC participants (no LOA designees) and Qwest representative, CLEC participants (no LOA designees) and/or Qwest representatives may approach a Regulator with the impasse issue. All parties must agree to the terms and process for resolution by a Regulator.~~

- **3rd Party**: If agreed upon by the CLEC participants (no LOA designee) and Qwest, a third party may be hired to resolve the specific issue. All parties must agree to the terms and process for resolution by a 3rd Party, including the handling of fees.

Attachment—Voting Tally Form

Voting Tally Form

The Voting Tally Form serves as a collective record of the individual vote on a specific issue. The results of the tally may be submitted with the working session meeting minutes as an attached document. However, each CLEC or authorized LOA representative who voted may decline to publish its voting result.

The form will include the following information:

- *CMP Re-design Working Session*: The date of the working session that caused this 'vote' to occur
- *Date of Vote*: The date of occurrence
- *Issue*: The issue that is causing the vote
- *Scenario*: State each scenario/position for a vote. Each scenario will be labeled A, B, C, etc.
- *CLEC Company*: A CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Core Team member's or a participant's company name
- *Core Team Member*: Write the name of the member that will participate in a 'vote.' If CLEC Company Core Team member is absent and no LOA has been executed, write ABSENT. The Core Team member is responsible to inform Qwest if there are any changes to CLEC representation.
- *Participating CLEC*: Write the name of the participant (non-Core Team member) <u>and</u> Company that will participate in a 'vote.'
- *LOA To*: Name of authorized representative that will participate in a 'vote.' A LOA must be presented to the Core Team members and given to Judy Schultz-Qwest to retain in file.
- *OK to Share Result (yes or no):* The CLEC or authorized LOA representative must write 'yes' or 'no' in this box to allow or deny permission for Qwest to publish the result of his/her vote in the working session meeting minutes.
- *A, B, C, D*: Vote for a scenario by placing a 'X' in the appropriate box.
- *Abstain*: Any participant may abstain to place a vote by placing an "X" in the box
- *CLEC Consensus*: A designated CLEC will insert the consensus position. The designated CLEC will also articulate to the working session audience the CLEC position so there is only one statement of the unified CLEC position.
- *Qwest's Position*: Qwest will insert Qwest's position on the specific issue.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

DRAFT

Voting Tally Form

CMP Re-design Working Session:	
Date of Vote:	

Issue:	
Scenario A:	
Scenario B:	
Scenario C:	
Scenario D:	

CLEC Company	**Core Team Member**	**LOA[1] To:**	**OK[2] to Share Result (yes/no)**	Vote				
				A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**Abstain**
Allegiance Telecom								
AT&T								
Avista								
Covad Communications								
Electric Light Wave								
Eschelon Telecom								
Integra Telecom								
McLeod USA								
SBC Telecom								
Scindo Networks								
Sprint								
WorldCom								

[1] CLEC has a Letter of Authorization in file that entitles another CLEC or 3rd Party Software Provider to vote on its behalf. The LOA is given to Judy Schultz/Qwest to retain in file.
[2] Each voter must indicate by writing a 'Yes' or 'No' if permission is given or denied to publish his/her Company's voting result.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design

DRAFT

Voting Tally Form

CMP Re-design Working Session:	
Date of Vote:	

Participating CLEC

CLEC Company	**Core Team Member**	**LOA To:**	**OK to Share Result (yes/no)**	Vote				
				A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**Abstain**

CLEC Consensus:	
Qwest's Position:	

Qwest Redlined CMP Re-design Framework

"Qwest Draft
2233a1v1 Origina

Qwest Thursday, Sep 20 Proposal

1. Qwest proposes that the following be used to replace the first bullet point in the dispute resolution process (I have attached a changed red-lined document with this suggestion):

Qwest or any CLEC that participated in the Escalation Process may suggest that the issue be resolved through an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process, such as arbitration or mediation using the American Arbitration Association (AAA) rules. If the parties agree to use an ADR process and agree upon the process and rules to be used, the dispute will be resolved through the agreed-upon ADR process.

2. Qwest proposes that the following be added to the suggested SGAT language regarding change management (I have attached a revised SGAT section):

As of the date of filing, the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process document (Exhibit G) is the subject of ongoing negotiations between Qwest and CLECs in the ongoing CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process. Not all of the sections of Exhibit G have been discussed or considered during the ongoing CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process, and the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process document will be continue to be changed through those discussions. Exhibit G reflects the commitments Qwest has made regarding maintaining its CMP as of the date of filing, and Qwest commits to implement agreements made in the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process as soon as practicable after they are made. Following the completion of the CLEC-Qwest Change Management process, Exhibit G will be subject to change through the CMP process. Qwest will maintain the most current version of the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process document on its wholesale website.

Qwest Thursday, Sep 20 Proposal

3. Qwest proposes that the following be used as the dispute resolution process for the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process:

Qwest is filing monthly status reports regarding this process in its 271 workshop processes, including in Colorado, Washington, Arizona, Oregon and the 7-State Process. Qwest will identify any current impasse issues in those reports to be treated as impasse issues in the 271 process.

QWEST DRAFT RECOMMENDATION
CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP) FOR LOCAL SERVICES
TABLE OF CONTENTS (ISSUE LIST)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

2.0 SCOPE

3.0 ADMINISTRATION

3.1 Managing the Change Management Process (CMP)

3.1.1 Enforcement of CMP

3.1.1.1 Dispute Resolution Process

3.1.2 Change Management Point-of-Contact (POC)

3.1.2.1 Change Management POC List

3.1.3 Preferred Method of Communication

3.2 Meetings

3.2.1 Meeting Materials (Distribution Package) for Change Management Meeting

3.2.2 Meeting Minutes for Change Management Meeting

3.2.3 Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site

3.3 Types of Changes

3.3.1 CLEC Originated Change

3.3.2 Qwest Originated Change

3.3.3 Industry Guideline Change

3.3.4 Regulatory Change

3.3.5 Tracking Change Requests (CRs)

3.4 Escalation Process

3.4.1 Guidelines

3.4.2 Cycle

3.4.3 Flow of Escalation Table

3.5 Interface Change Request Initiation Process

3.5.1 OSS Interface CR Status Update Definitions

3.5.2 Clarification for New CLEC-initiated CRs

4.0 PRIORITIZATION

4.1 Guidelines

4.2 Qualified CLECs

4.2.1 For New Interfaces

4.2.2 Changes to Existing OSS Interfaces

5.0 OSS INTERFACE ACTVIVITES

5.1 Introduction of a New Interface

5.1.1 Introduction of a New Application-to-Application Interface

5.1.1.1 Initial Release Announcement

5.1.1.2 Final Release Requirements

5.1.2 Introduction of a New GUI Interface

5.2 Change to an Existing Application-to-Application Interface

5.2.1 Requirements Review

5.2.1.1 Draft Interface Release Requirements

5.2.1.1.1 Qwest/CLEC Originated Changes

5.2.1.2 Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements

5.2.1.3 Walk Through of Draft Interface Release Requirements

5.2.1.3.1 Walk Through Notification Content

5.2.1.3.2 Conduct of Walk Through

5.2.1.4 CLEC Comments on Initial Draft Documentation Publication

5.2.1.5 Qwest Response to Comments

5.2.1.6 Content of Final Business Rules and Technical Specifications Release Requirements

5.3 Change to an Existing Graphical User Interface (GUI)

5.3.1 Requirements Review

5.3.1.1 Draft GUI Requirements

5.3.1.1.1 Qwest/CLEC Originated Changes

5.3.1.2 Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements

5.3.1.3 CLEC Comments on Initial Draft Documentation Publication

5.3.1.4 Qwest Response to Comments

5.3.1.5 Content of Final Notification

5.3.1.6

5.4 Retirement of an Existing Interface

5.4.1 Initial CLEC Notification of Interface Retirement

5.4.2 Final Retirement Notice

6.0 TYPE OF PRODUCT AND PROCESS ACTIVITIES

6.1 Category Once: Change to CLEC Procedures

6.1.1 Category One Notification

6.1.2 Category One Implementation Interval

6.1.3 Category One Walk-Through of Change

6.1.4 Category One CLEC Comments on Proposed Change

6.2 Category Two: Informational Change

6.2.1 Category Two Notification

6.2.2 Category Two Implementation Interval

6.2.3 Category Two CLEC Comments on Informational Change

6.3 Category Three: Exception Changes

7.0 COMMENT CYCLE

7.1 CLEC Comments

7.2 Qwest Responses

7.3 Issue Log

7.4 Documentation

8.0 EXCEPTIONS

8.1 Exception NoticeCLEC Comments on Exception Request Implementation of Exception

9.0 INTERFACE TESTING

9.1 CLEC Test Environment (CTE)

9.2 New Release Testing

9.3 Production Support Testing

10.0 TRAINING

11.0POST IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT

11.1 Post Implementation Management

11.1.1 Production Stopped

11.1.2 Production Degraded

12.0 PRODUCTION SUPPORT

CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP) FOR LOCAL SERVICES ~~ORDERING AND PROVISIONING~~

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 7

TYPES OF CHANGE 10

I. Type 1 (Production Support) Change 10

II. Type 2 (Regulatory) Change 11

III. Type 3 (Industry Guideline) Change 11

IV. Type 4 (Provider Originated) Change 12

V. Type 5 (~~Customer~~CLEC Originated) Change 12

VI. Tracking Change Requests 13

CHANGE REQUEST INITIATION PROCESS 14

I. ~~Customer~~CLEC Originated Requests 14

II. Provider Originated Requests 16

INTRODUCTION OF A NEW INTERFACE 17

I. Release Planning 17

II. ~~Customer~~CLEC Responses/Comments 17

III. Provider Responses/Comments 18

IV. Final Release Announcement 18

CHANGE TO EXISTING INTERFACES 19

I. Interface Change Process 19

II. Versioning of Type 1 Changes 19

III. Versioning of Type 2 Changes 19

IV. Versioning of Type 3 Changes 20

V. Versioning of Type 4 and Type 5 Changes 20

RETIREMENT OF EXISTING INTERFACES *21*

I. Initial Retirement Plans *21*

II. Final Retirement Notice 21

MANAGING THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS **22**

I. Change Management POC **22**

II. Purpose of Change Management POC **22**

III. Change Management POC List Creation **22**

IV. Formal Method of Communication **23**

V. Governing Body **23**

MEETINGS **25**

I. Agenda Items for Change Management Meeting **26**

II. Change Management Meeting Action Log and Change Request Status **28**

III. Meeting Minutes for Change Management Meeting **28**

IV. Provider Change Management Process Web Site **29**

REQUIREMENTS REVIEW *31*

I. Draft Interface Release Requirements *31*

II. Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements *31*

III. Walk Through of Draft Interface Release Requirements *32*

IV. ~~Customer~~CLEC's Comments on Draft Interface Release Requirements *32*

V. Provider Response to Comments *32*

VI. Final Interface Release Requirements *32*

VII. Content of Final Interface Release Requirements 33

PRIORITIZATION *34*

I. Prioritization Review *34*

II. Prioritization Process *34*

III. Voting 35

ESCALATION PROCESS **36**

I. Guidelines **36**

II. Cycle **36**

INTERFACE TESTING ***39***

I. New Release & Production Support Testing in the ~~Customer~~CLEC Test Environment (CTE) ***39***

II. New Release Testing ***39***

III. Getting Ready for the New Release Testing ***40***

IV. Production Support Testing **40**

TRAINING **41**

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

DEFINITION OF TERMS ***44***

GLOSSARY OF TERMS ***45***

APPENDIX A: CHANGE REQUEST FORM AND CHECKLIST ***46***

I. Appendix A-1: Change Request Form ***46***

II. Appendix A-2: Change Request Form Checklist ***50***

APPENDIX B: CHANGE REQUEST PRIORITIZATION FORM **53**

APPENDIX C: CMP PRIORITIZATION PROCESS EXAMPLE **54**

CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS (CMP) FOR LOCAL SERVICE ORDERING AND PROVISIONING

NEED REFERENCE TO CUSTOMERCLEC/PROVIDER NEGOTIATIONS
INTRODUCTION [Need to re-address at a later date]
Action Item #17

The Change Management Process (CMP) is the a formal method used by customersCompetitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs) and Qwest and a local service providers to initiate, communicate, prioritize, schedule, testcommunicate about and implementchanges enhancements changes to Qwestprovider Operational Support Systems (OSS) interfaces which directly or indirectly impact a CLEC[1] used in connection with resell services, and unbundled network elements[2] changes include new functionality enhancements to existing functionality, client maintenance, and introduction/retirement of interfaces and Application Program Interfaces (API's).

This change management process creates a framework for meeting the changes in local providers Qwest's business and technical environment, introduction or discussion. The CLEC customer should Of Control (POC) may request interface changes for future consideration by submitting a Change Request (CR) to the provider (Qwest's POC).

~~The FCC requires Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers to have processes for management of manual and electronic interfaces relative to order, pre order, account maintenance, testing and billing. The scope of this document is to define only the processes for change management of manual and electronic interfaces relative to order and pre-order functions.~~

SCOPE [need to readdress at a later date]
Action Item 17

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

~~This document defines the processes for change management of manual and electronic interfaces relative[1] to pre-order,[2] and pre-order,[2] provisioning, maintenance/repair, and billing functions. Interface impact is defined as changes to field content or format, or changes in the business rules used to govern field population. This includes national guideline changes, e.g. LSOG as well as provider Qwest specific interface process and system changes. Changes include new functionality, enhancements to existing functionality, introduction/retirement of interfaces processes and systems and maintenance activities affecting production defects. Desired changes should be submitted to the appropriate ATIS Forum.~~

~~This scope includes any pre-order, order, business rules, interface, system testing and maintenance that impact ongoing and future technical and operational processes, and changes that alter the relationship in the manner in which the provider Qwest and customer a CLEC do business.~~

~~The CMP provides a means for changes to the provider's OSSs and their business rules. The customer's Point Of Contact (POC) may request interface changes for future consideration by submitting a Change Request Form to the provider's POC. These requests may include new functionality or changes to existing functionality.~~

~~The types of changes that will be handled by this process are:~~

- ~~Software changes~~
- ~~System Environment Configuration changes~~
- ~~Changes resulting from new or changed Industry Guidelines / Standards~~
- ~~Product and Services (e.g., new services available via the in-scope interfaces)~~
- ~~Processes (e.g., electronic interfaces and manual processes relative to order and pre-order)~~
- ~~Regulatory~~
- ~~Documentation (e.g., business rules for electronic and manual processes relative to order and pre-order.~~
- ~~Defect resolution~~
- ~~Guidelines for provider-specific change management processes~~

~~The provider~~Qwest will track changes to the OSS interfaces as change requests and assign a tracking number to each change request. The CMP begins with the

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

identification of the change request and encompasses requirement definition, design, development, notification, testing, implementation and decommissioning of the change request.

The CMP is managed by ~~customer~~CLEC and provider representatives each having distinct roles and responsibilities. The ~~customer~~CLEC and ~~the provider~~Qwest will hold regular meetings to exchange information about the status of existing change requests, the need for new changes, what changes ~~the provider~~Qwest is proposing, how the process is working, etc. The process also allows for escalation to resolve disputes, if necessary.

The CMP is dynamic in nature and, as such, is managed through the regularly scheduled meetings and is based on group consensus. This document may be revised, through the procedures set forth by the OBF, as business and/or regulatory conditions dictate.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Managed Changes
Changes to Existing Interfaces

TYPES OF CHANGE

The change requests should fall into one of the following classifications:

[redacted] *Type 1 (Production Support) Change*

A Type 1 change corrects problems discovered in production versions of an OSS application interface.[1] Either the providerQwest or the customerCLEC may initiate the change request.[2] Typically this type of change reflects instances where a technical implementation is faulty or inaccurate such as to cause correctly or properly formatted data to be rejected. Instances where providersQwest or customerCLECs misinterpret interface specifications and/or business rules must be addressed on a case-by-case basis. All parties will take all reasonable steps to ensure that any disagreements regarding the interpretation of a new or modified business process are identified and resolved during the change management reviews of the change requests. Type 1 changes will be processed on an expedited basis by means of an emergency release of software/documentation.

Additionally, once a Type 1 change is identified, the change management team (see the Managing The Change Management Process section) must determine the nature and scope of the maintenance. Type 1 changes are categorized in the following manner:

Severity 1: *Production "Stopped" Interface Unusable – Interface discrepancy results in totally unusable interface requiring emergency repair. CustomerCLEC Orders/Pre-Orders cannot be submitted or will not be accepted by the providerQwest and manual work-arounds are not feasible. Correction is considered essential to continued operation. The providerQwest and customerCLECs should dedicate resources to expedite resolution.*

Acknowledgment Notification – 1 – 1 Hour

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Status Notification = bi-hourly

Severity 2: *Production Degraded: Interface Affecting – An interface discrepancy that requires a work-around(s) on the part of the customer CLEC or the provider Qwest. The change is considered critical to continued operation. It does not stop production, but affects key applications.*

Acknowledgment Notification = 4 hours
Status Notification = weekly
Implementation time = 14 - 30 calendar days

Severity 3: *Process Impacted: Pre-order / Order requests can be submitted and will be accepted through normal processes / interfaces. Clarification is considered necessary to ongoing operations.*

Acknowledgment Notification = 7 calendar days
Implementation time = 30 - 60 calendar days

II. Type 2 (Regulatory Change)

A Type 2 change is mandated by regulatory or legal entities, such as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), a state commission (authority), state and federal courts. Regulatory changes are not voluntary but are requisite to comply with newly passed legislation, regulatory requirements, or court rulings. Either the customer CLEC or the provider Qwest may initiate the change request.

III. Type 3 (Industry Guideline Change)

A Type 3 change implements a mandatory Alliance Industry Guideline change. Implementing industry guidelines using a national implementation timeline, if any. Either the provider Qwest or the customer CLEC may initiate the change request. These guidelines are industry defined by:

Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) Sponsored:

- Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF)
- Local Service Ordering and Provisioning Committee (LSOP)
- Telecommunications Industry Forum (TCIF)

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

- Electronic Commerce Interexchange Committee (ECIC)
- Electronic Data Interface Committee (EDI)
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI) [Action item#]

IV. Type 4 (Provider Originated) Change Qwest Originated Change

A Type 4 [A Qwest Originated change is originated by the provider Qwest does not fall within the changes listed above and is within the scope of CMP and affects interfaces between customers and the provider. These changes may include an enhancement, manual process, or business process.]

V. Type 5 (Customer) CLEC Originated Change CLEC Originated Change

A Type 5 [A CLEC Originated change is originated by the customer CLEC does not fall within the changes listed above and is within the scope of CMP and affects interfaces between customers and the provider. These changes may include a business process improvement, [illegible] customer [illegible] seeking to [illegible] implied [illegible] the customer CLEC wishes [illegible] the provider Qwest.]

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

VI. Tracking Change Requests move to CR initiation process

The provider Qwest will assign a tracking number to each change request and track changes to each change request. Tracking will be accomplished via a change request log.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

CHANGE REQUEST INITIATION PROCESS

The ~~customer~~CLEC ~~or provider~~ change request initiator ~~should~~ will complete a Change Request Form (see Appendix X~~A~~) as defined by the instructions on ~~the provider~~Qwest's CMP web site. The Change Request Form ~~should~~ is also ~~be~~ located on ~~the provider~~Qwest's CMP web site.

~~I.Customer~~CLEC Originated Requests –

The ~~customer~~CLEC will submit the Change Request Form to ~~the provider~~ the appropriate Qwest CMP Manager electronically as defined in the CR Form instructions.~~via e-mail~~. ~~The provider~~Qwest will review the submitted change request for completeness. Within two (2) business days of receipt, ~~the provider~~Qwest will either request information to ensure a complete request or will return a tracking number for the change request. This will ~~normally~~ be done via email to the originator. Within ex (x) business days after the CR Tracking number has been assigned, Qwest will contact the CR originator to schedule ~~the provider~~Qwest clarification discussions if necessary.

Qwest will provide a response notification to the CLECs within X business days via email and will be posted on the CMP web site. The CR originator may request a conference call before the next scheduled CMP Meeting to discuss the provided response

Change requests that have been assigned a tracking number fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the next prioritization meeting will be included on the spreadsheet of change requests pending initial rating.

Within twenty-one (21) calendar days after the change request is submitted, ~~the provider~~Qwest will provide a preliminary assessment indicating one of the following:

- *The change request is accepted and is a candidate for prioritization (see Prioritization section).*
- *The change request is rejected, and the reason for rejection.*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

All valid change requests and the change request log will be posted on ~~the provider~~Qwest's web site.

~~Customer~~CLECs may submit a formal request to ~~the provider~~Qwest to re-rate a change request no later than fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the next prioritization review. The request must include a reason for requesting the re-rate. This will normally be done via e-mail to ~~the provider~~Qwest with a copy to all Change Management team members.

~~Customer~~CLEC initiated requests are Type 5, except when the proposed change has an impact on a regulatory mandate, e.g. metrics. Change requests that have impact on regulatory mandates are Type 2.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

~~II.~~VII. *Provider Originated Requests*

Provider initiated requests are Type 4, except when the proposed change has an impact on a regulatory mandate, e.g. metrics. Change requests that have impact on regulatory mandates are Type 2.

Type 4 requests will be made available to ~~customer~~CLECs at least fourteen (14) calendar days prior to a scheduled prioritization review. The Type 4 change requests, except those that are related to new products or services, are prioritized by ~~customer~~CLECs with Type 5 change requests (see Prioritization section).

If ~~the provider~~Qwest announces a new interface before applicable guidelines are finalized at the appropriate industry forums, ~~the provider~~Qwest will review the final guidelines when they are issued. The review will determine any alterations that may be necessary for compliance with the finalized requirements and will work the changes within the guidelines of the CMP. ~~The provider~~Qwest will review its system requirements and provide known exceptions to industry guidelines.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

INTRODUCTION OF A NEW INTERFACE

The process for introducing a new interface will be part of the CMP.

I. *Release Planning*

At least nine (9) months in advance of the target implementation date, ~~the provider~~Qwest will share the new interface plans via web site posting and ~~customer~~CLEC notification.

~~The provider~~Qwest will share preliminary plans for the new interface, including:

- *Proposed functionality of the interface*
- *Proposed detailed implementation time line (e.g., milestone dates, ~~customer~~CLEC/provider comment/response turnaround dates)*
- *Provider constraints*
- *Exceptions to industry guidelines/standards, etc.*
- *Proposed ~~customer~~CLEC/provider meeting plans (The first scheduled meeting should be held no sooner than fourteen (14) calendar days following publication of the ~~customer~~CLEC notification.)*
- *Requirements*
- *Design & Development*
- *Connectivity and Firewall Rules*
- *Test Planning*
- *Implementation*
- *Change Control*

II. *~~Customer~~CLEC Responses/Comments*

Upon review of the preliminary plans for the interface if the ~~customer~~CLEC wishes to provide feedback the ~~customer~~CLEC must send a written response to ~~the provider~~Qwest. These responses must be provided no later than seven (7) calendar days prior to the first scheduled meeting. The ~~customer~~CLEC's response will specify the ~~customer~~CLEC's questions, issues and any alternative recommendations.
~~Customer~~CLECs may provide feedback to ~~the provider~~Qwest during ~~customer~~CLEC/provider meetings. Additional ~~customer~~CLEC feedback may be

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

provided in accordance with the dates outlined in the detailed implementation time line.

III. *Provider Responses/Comments*

~~The provider~~Qwest will maintain both a proprietary and non-proprietary issue log containing ~~customer~~CLEC comments and ~~the provider~~Qwest responses. This non-proprietary issue log will be posted to ~~the provider~~Qwest's web site upon receipt of ~~customer~~CLEC feedback. ~~The provider~~Qwest will respond to the ~~customer~~CLEC feedback in accordance with the dates outlined in the detailed implementation time line. ~~The provider~~Qwest will also communicate its base line interface development plans via web site posting and ~~customer~~CLEC notification in accordance with the dates outlined in the detailed implementation time line.

IV. *Final Release Announcement*

~~The provider~~Qwest will provide a Final Release Announcement to the ~~customer~~CLECs via web site posting and a carrier notification.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

CHANGE TO EXISTING INTERFACES

~~I.Interface~~ Pre-order, Order application-to-application Change Process
(Action item#)

As part of its rolling twelve (12) month development view, ~~providers~~Qwest will prepare a preliminary package of the required changes and will share these plans at scheduled change management meetings. ~~Providers~~Qwest should make available two (2) versions of an interface between the sunrise and sunset dates.

Unless mandated, ~~the provider~~Qwest will implement no more than four (4) releases requiring coding changes to the ~~customer~~CLEC interfaces within a calendar year. These changes should occur no less than three (3) months apart.

~~II.~~V. *Versioning of Type 1 Changes*

For Type 1 changes, the version number will not be incremented and will not cause the oldest dot version of the current version to be retired as a result of the implemented fix.

~~III.~~VI. *Versioning of Type 2 Changes*

For Type 2 changes that must occur between regularly scheduled releases, ~~the provider~~Qwest will not retire the oldest version in order to implement the Type 2 change. The Type 2 change will be implemented as either a dot release or a sub-dot release of all versions (except a retired version), unless the structure of the old version could not accommodate the Type 2 change or the old version is scheduled to be retired within the next six months.

If the Type 2 change results in an interface implementation, before applicable industry guidelines are finalized at the appropriate industry forums, dot release versioning is issued. An example of dot versioning of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation is V5.1.

If the Type 2 change results in an interface implementation that is in line with industry guidelines, sub-dot release versioning is issued. An example of sub-dot release of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation is V5.0.1.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Type 2 changes that occur at the time of a regularly scheduled release will be made in all versions (except a retired version). If the structure or intent of the old version cannot accommodate the change then, via the Prioritization process a joint provider/~~customer~~CLEC decision is made that the mandate should not be implemented in an old version.

~~IV.~~VII. *Versioning of Type 3 Changes*

For Type 3 changes, the base version identity should follow the LSOG issue identity. For example, the first release of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation should be V5.0.

~~V.~~VIII. *Versioning of Type 4 and Type 5 Changes*

Type 4 and Type 5 changes will be implemented as a sub-dot release of all versions, unless the structure of the old version could not accommodate the Type 4 or Type 5 change.

If the Type 4 or Type 5 change results in an interface implementation, before applicable industry guidelines are finalized at the appropriate industry forums, dot release versioning is issued. An example of dot versioning of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation is V5.1.

If the Type 4 or Type 5 change results in an interface implementation that is in line with industry guidelines, sub-dot release versioning is issued. An example of sub-dot release of a provider's LSOG Issue 5 implementation is V5.0.1.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

RETIREMENT OF EXISTING INTERFACES

The retirement of an interface is ~~the provider~~Qwest's elimination of an existing interface (i.e., paper, GUI, Gateway).

I. *Initial Retirement Plans*

At least nine (9) months in advance of the target retirement date, ~~the provider~~Qwest will share the retirement plans via web site posting and ~~customer~~CLEC notification. If the functionality exists through another interface, ~~the provider~~Qwest will announce the retirement nine (9) months prior to the actual retirement. If the equivalent functionality does not exist through an existing interface but will reside in a scheduled new interface, ~~the provider~~Qwest will announce the retirement at the same time as the new interface. The scheduled new interface is to be in a ~~customer~~CLEC certified production release prior to the retirement of the older interface.

The ~~customer~~CLEC notification will contain:

- *The rationale for retiring the interface*
- *The proposed detailed retirement time line (e.g., milestone dates, ~~customer~~CLEC/provider comment/response turnaround dates)*

II. *Final Retirement Notice*

The Final Retirement Notice will be provided to ~~customer~~CLECs and contain:

- *Where the replacement functionality will reside in a new interface and when the new interface has been certified by a ~~customer~~CLEC*
- *Provider's responses to the ~~customer~~CLECs' comments*
- *Actual retirement date*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

ADMINISTRATION
MANAGING THE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS
FROM AUGUST 9, 2001 REDLINED FRAMEWORK

I. Change Management POC

The provider, Qwest, and each customer CLEC will designate primary and secondary change management POC(s) who will serve as the official designees for matters regarding this CMP. The primary POC is the official voting member and a secondary (alternate) POC can vote in the absence of the primary POC for each CLEC.

II. Purpose of Change Management POC

The change management POC will serve as the official designee for all matters regarding change management, including:

- Submission of change requests[1][2]
- Notification of formal matters, such as [illegible]

The customer CLECs and Qwest will exchange POC information including items such as (must provide the following information to the provider's change management POC):

- Name
- Title
- Company
- Telephone number
- E-mail address
- Fax number
- Cell phone/Pager number

III. Change Management POC List Creation

1. [illegible]

The provider will create a distribution list and publish this list. Primary and secondary CLEC POCs should be included in the Qwest maintained distribution list. At least a primary customer POC and secondary customer

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

POC should be included in the distribution list. It is the CLECs responsibility to notify Qwest of any POC changes. It is the provider's responsibility to maintain and update the information on the list with the assistance of the customer. This list will be used to update customers on change management issues. The list will be made available to all participating CLECs with the permission of the POCs.

V.III. Formal Preferred Method of Communication

The standard methods of communication are mail, e-mail, website, telephone and fax. Critical matters will be communicated using the distribution list. The preferred method of communication is e-mail with supporting information posted to the website.

V.IV. Governing Body

The change management organizational structure must support the CMP. Each position within the organization has defined roles and responsibilities as outlined below.

CMP Team: Representatives from the customer CLECs or their authorized agents[1] and the provider Qwest. The team meets monthly to review, prioritize and make recommendations for change management requests. The change management requests are used as input to internal change management processes.

CMP Steering Committee: The CMP Steering Committee consists of representatives from the customer CLECs and the provider Qwest who will be responsible for managing compliance to the CMP documents.[2] The responsibilities of the CMP Steering Committee are:

- *On-going commitment*
- *Participation in change management meetings/conference calls*
- *Reviewing changes/suggestions to the CMP document for submittal to OBF*
- *Process improvements*
- *Managing meeting schedule logistics*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

A standing agenda item at the regular change management meetings will provide an opportunity for ~~the provider~~Qwest and ~~customer~~CLECs to assess the effectiveness of the CMP. Both the ~~customer~~CLECs and the ~~provider~~Qwest will use this opportunity to provide feedback of instances of non-compliance and commit to taking appropriate action(s).

~~Provider~~ POC: The ~~provider~~Qwest POC is responsible for managing the CMP. The ~~provider~~Qwest POC will be responsible for maintaining the integrity of the change requests, prepping for and facilitating review meetings, presenting change requests to the ~~provider~~Qwest's internal CMP, and ensuring that all notifications are communicated to the appropriate parties.

~~Customer~~CLEC POC: The ~~customer~~CLEC POC will serve as the official designee for all matters regarding CMP, including:

- *Submission of ~~customer~~CLEC change request forms*
- *Notification of critical matters such as Type 1 errors*

Release Management Team: A team of ~~customer~~CLEC and ~~provider~~ representatives who manage the implementation of scheduled releases.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

MEETINGS

~~Change Management meetings will be conducted monthly.~~
FROM AUGUST 8, 2001 REDLINED FRAMEWORK

Change Management meetings will be conducted on a regularly scheduled basis, at least on a monthly basis. Meeting participants can choose to attend meetings in person or participate by conference call.

Meetings are held to review, prioritize, manage the implementation of process and system changes and address change management requests. Qwest will review the status of all applicable change requests. The meeting may also include discussions of Qwest's development view.

CLEC's request for additional agenda items and associated materials should be submitted to Qwest at least five (5) business days by noon (MST) in advance of the meeting. Qwest is responsible for distributing the agenda and associated meeting materials at least three (3) business days by noon (MST) in advance of the meeting. Qwest will be responsible for preparing, maintaining, and distributing meeting minutes . Attendees with any walk-on items should bring materials of the walk-on items to the meeting.

All attendees, whether in person or by phone, must identify themselves and the company they represent.

Additional meetings may be held at the request of Qwest or any qualified CLEC (as defined in this document). Meeting notification must contain an agenda plus any supporting meeting materials. These meetings should be announced at least five (5) business days prior to their occurrence. Exceptions may be made for emergency situations.

~~The provider is responsible for notifying customers and distributing agendas and other meeting materials (to include, but not limited to, actual change requests received from the customers and documentation of industry~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Meeting materials should include the following information:

- Meeting Logistics
- Minutes from previous meeting
- Agenda
- Change Requests and responses
  - New/Active
  - Updated
  - Log
- Issues, Action Items Log and associated statuses
- Release Summary12 Month Development View
- Monthly System Outage Report
- Any other material to be discussed

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Qwest will provide Meeting Materials (Distribution Package) electronically by noon 3 business days prior to the Monthly CMP Meeting. In addition, Qwest will provide hard copies of the Distribution Package at the Monthly CMP Meeting.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

II. Change Management Meeting Action Log and Change Request Status

The provider will maintain and distribute at the change management meeting an Action Item Log containing action items from previous meetings and status. Additionally, during the change management meetings, the provider will review status of the customer change requests. The meeting will include discussions of the provider's development view, as well as any customer's suggested development to the provider Operations Support Systems (OSS[1])

III. Meeting Minutes for Change Management Meeting
FROM AUGUST 8, 2001 REDLINED FRAMEWORK

- Qwest will take minutes.

Qwest will summarize discussions in meeting minutes and include any revised documents such as Issues, Action items and statuses.

Minutes should be distributed to meeting participants for comments or revisions no later than five (5) business days by noon (MST)after the meeting. CLEC comments should be provided within two (2) business days by noon (MST). Revised minutes, if CLEC comments are received , should be distributed within nine (9) business days by noon (MST) after the meeting.

The provider will take minutes during the meeting. Meeting minutes should include, but are not limited to the following:

- Current status of change requests and Release Notices
- Issues/Action items and status
- Attendees/Company

A draft version of the minutes should be distributed to meeting participants for comments or revisions no later than seven (7) calendar days after the meeting. Customers need to respond to the provider with any modifications to the draft version within two (2) business days. Revisions and comments will be incorporated into the final minutes. The final minutes will be distributed within eleven (11) calendar days after the meeting.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

IV.V. ProviderQwest Change Management Process Wholesale CMP Web Site[Need to re-visit – ACTION ITEM #17G]
FROM AUGUST 8, 2001 REDLINED FRAMEWORK

To facilitate access to CMP documentation, the providerQwest will maintain CMP information on its web site. The web site should be easy to use and updated in a timely manner. The Web site should be a well organized central repository for CLEC notifications and CMP documentation. Active documentation including meeting materials (Distribution Package), should be maintained on the website. Change Requests and release notifications should be identified in accordance with the agreed upon naming convention, to facilitate ease of identification. [action item #] Qwest will maintain closed and old versions of documents on the web site's Archive page for 18 months before storing off line. Information that has been removed from the web site can be obtained by contacting the appropriate Qwest CMP Manager. At a minimum the CMP web site will contain/include:

- [illegible] version of the ProviderQwest CMP document describing CMP's purpose and scope of setting forth the CMP objectives, procedures, and timelines, including release life cycles.
- Calendar of release dates
- OSS hours of availability
- Links to related web sites, such as IMA EDI, IMA GUI, CEMR, and Notices
- Current CMP escalation process
- CMP prioritization process description and guidelines
- Change Request form and instructions to complete form
- Submitted and open Change Requests and the status of each
- Responses to Change Requests and written responses to CLEC inquiries
- Meeting (formal and informal) information for CMP monthly meetings and interim meetings or conference calls, including descriptions of meetings and participants, agendas, sign-up forms, and schedules

[redacted]

Joint Release Test Plan Template

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

- A log of customer CLEC and provider Qwest change requests and associated statuses
- Issue/Action items and statusesMeeting materials/distribution package
- Meeting minutes
- Release announcements and other CLEC notifications and associated requirements
- Directory to CLEC notifications for the month
- Business rules, SATE test case scenarios technical specifications and user guides will be provided via links on the CMP website based on the LSOC and provider's specific requirements
- Contact information for the CMP POC list, including CLEC, Qwest and other participants (with participant consent to publish contact information on web page).

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

I. Draft Interface Release Requirements

Prior to implementing a new interface or a change to an existing interface, the ~~provider~~Qwest will notify ~~customer~~CLECs of the draft release requirements.

Notification and confirmation time lines for Type 1 are determined on an individual case basis based on the severity of the problem.

Notifications for Type 2 changes are based on applicable Part 271 or regulatory rules.

Type 3 time lines are based on ~~customer~~CLEC / provider agreement in conjunction with the rollout of national guidelines. (See Issue 1214 New Issue Life Cycle Process) subject to any overriding regulatory obligations.

Generally a Type 4 and a Type 5 change notification will occur in [illegible] calendar days prior to implementing the change. Draft business rules and technical specifications will be produced and distributed to ~~customer~~CLECs 60 calendar days prior to implementation. ~~Customer~~CLECs have fifteen (15) calendar days from the initial publication of draft documentation to provide comments / questions on the documentation. Change confirmation will occur [illegible] calendar days prior to implementation through publication of final business rules / technical specifications.

For Type 4 or Type 5 change requests more or less notification may be provided based on severity and the impact of the change. In this example, the ~~provider~~Qwest can implement the change in less than 45 calendar days.

Documentation of new or revised error messages associated with Type 4 or Type 5 change requests will be provided no later than 30 calendar days prior to implementation date.

II. Content of Draft Interface Release Requirements

The Notification letter will contain:

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Written summary of change(s)
Target time frame for implementation
Any cross-reference to updated documentation such as the Users Guide. This type of documentation should also include a summary of changes made to the document

III. Walk Through of Draft Interface Release Requirements

If requested by one or more customerCLECs within fourteen (14) calendar days of receiving the initial Release Requirements, the providerQwest will sponsor a walk through with the appropriate internal subject matter experts. The providerQwest will hold this walk through no later than thirty (30) calendar days prior to the scheduled implementation.

IV. customerCLEC's Comments on Draft Interface Release Requirements

If the customerCLEC identifies issues or requires clarification, the customerCLEC must send a written response to the providerQwest and the customerCLECs Account Manager. The providerQwest must receive the customerCLECs response seven (7) calendar days prior to the date of the Initial Release Requirements. The response will specify the customerCLEC's questions, issues, and/or alternative recommendations for implementation.

V. Provider Response to Comments

The providerQwest will review and respond with written answers to all customerCLEC issues, comments, concerns within seven (7) calendar days. The answers will be shared with all customerCLECs[1] unless the question(s) are marked proprietary. Any changes that may occur as a result of the responses will be distributed to all customerCLECs in the same notification letter.

VI. Final Interface Release Requirements

The notification letter resulting from the customerCLEC's response from the Initial Release Notification will constitute the Final Release Requirements.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

VII. *Content of Final Interface Release Requirements*

In addition to the content of Interface Initial Release Requirements, the Final Release will include the following:

- *Summary of changes from the ~~provider~~Qwest response to comments*
- *Indication of type of change (e.g., documentation, changes, business rule change, clarification change)*
- *Changed requirements pages*
- *Release date*
- *Internal before implementation of release*

The ~~provider~~Qwest's planned implementation date will not be sooner than forty-five (45) calendar days from the date of the final release requirements. The ~~provider~~Qwest will post notification on provider's web site to inform the ~~customer~~CLECs of possible impact to ~~customer~~CLEC ordering ability. The ~~provider~~Qwest will post this information forty-five (45) calendar days prior to the scheduled implementation of such changes if possible but not less than thirty (30) calendar days prior to implementation. Emergency changes that occur without advance notification will be posted within 24 hours of the changes. The implementation time line for the release will not begin until all related documentation is provided.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

PRIORITIZATION

I. *Prioritization Review*

The prioritization review provides the forum for reviewing and prioritizing Type 4 and Type 5 change requests. ~~The provider~~Qwest will facilitate the meeting. Both ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~providers~~Qwest should have appropriate subject matter experts in attendance. Meetings will be held monthly, or more frequently if needed, and are open to all ~~customer~~CLECs. The prioritization review objectives are to:

- *Introduce newly initiated ~~customer~~CLEC and provider change requests.*
- *Allow ~~customer~~CLECs to prioritize new change requests and re-rate existing change requests by providing specific input as to the relative importance that ~~customer~~CLECs, as a group, assign to each such change request.*
- *Provide status on outstanding ~~customer~~CLEC and provider change requests.*
- *~~The provider~~Qwest will distribute all materials fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the prioritization review. The materials will include:*
  - *Agenda*
  - *Prioritized spreadsheet of Type 4 and Type 5 change requests*
  - *Spreadsheet of change requests pending initial rating and re-rating (see Appendix B)*
  - *New change requests as submitted by initiating ~~customer~~CLEC or provider*

II. *Prioritization Process*

During the review, the initiators will present their new change requests and any requests for re-rate. This will be followed by a question and answer session. After all presentations are complete, the voting of change requests will begin.

Re-rate requests will only be accepted from ~~customer~~CLECs who participated in the initial voting. Once a re-rate is requested, all ~~customer~~CLECs participating at the subsequent meeting can submit a rating.

~~Customer~~CLECs may request and rate a modification to a new change request at the prioritization review, if agreed to by the originating ~~customer~~CLEC(s). The

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

originating ~~customer~~CLEC must update the change request with the agreed upon modification.

III. *Voting*

Voting should be conducted according to the following guidelines:

- *A ~~customer~~CLEC must either be using the interface impacted by the change request or have a Letter of Intent to use the interface on file with ~~the provider~~Qwest to participate in the vote.*
- *Each ~~customer~~CLEC is allowed one vote per change request and should have one representative responsible to provide a rating. Each ~~customer~~CLEC can only assign a rating to a change request at the prioritization review. A rating will not be accepted outside of the prioritization review.*
- *~~Customer~~CLECs may only provide a rating at the meeting where the new change request is introduced. ~~Customer~~CLECs that were not present at that meeting may not submit ratings at subsequent meetings, unless there is a request to re-rate.*
- *A ~~customer~~CLEC may delegate its vote to an authorized agent acting on its behalf by providing a Letter of Authority.*
- *Each participating ~~customer~~CLEC ranks each change request by providing a rank from 1 (low) to 5 (high). Votes will be averaged to determine order of ranking and results (see Appendix C) will be provided prior to the close of the prioritization review.*
- *~~Customer~~CLECs can defer/pass on voting. A rating of defer or pass will not be averaged in the overall rating.*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

ESCALATION PROCESS

FROM SEPTEMBER 18, 2001 REDESIGN SESSION

I. Guidelines

- The escalation process will include items that are defined as within the CMP scope.
- The decision to escalate is left to the discretion of the ~~customer~~CLEC, based on the severity of the missed or unaccepted response/resolution
- Escalations may also involve issues related to CMP itself, including the administration of the CMP ~~can involve issues related to the CMP, itself~~
- ~~Escalations involving change requests,~~ the expectation is that escalation should occur only after normal change management procedures have occurred per the CMP

~~Three (3) levels of escalation shall be available. They are:~~

~~1.The customer's change management director (or designated agent) to provider's change management director~~

~~2.The customer's change management director to provider's account director~~

~~3.The customer's vice president to provider's vice president~~

~~Each level of escalation will go through the same cycle, as follows:~~

II. Cycle

Item must be formally escalated as an e-mail sent to the Qwest CMP escalation e-mail address [URL to be established] ~~the appropriate provider escalation level.~~

- Subject line of the escalation e-mail must include:
  - CLEC Company name
  - "ESCALATION"
  - Change Request (CR) number and status, if applicable
- Content of e-mail must enclose appropriate supporting documentation, if applicable, and to the extent that the supporting documentation does not include the following information, the following must be provided.:
  - Description of item being escalated
  - History of item

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

  - Reason for Escalation
  - Business need and impact
  - Desired CLEC resolution
  - CLEC contact information including Name, Title, Phone Number, and e-mail address
- Qwest will acknowledge receipt of the complete escalation e-mail with an acknowledgement of the e-mail no later than the close of business of the following business day. If the escalation email does not contain the following specified information Qwest will notify the CLEC by the close of business on the following business day, identifying and requesting information that was not originally included. When the escalation email is complete, the acknowledgement email will include:
  - Date and time of escalation receipt
  - Date and time of acknowledgement email
  - Name, phone number and email address of the Qwest Director, or above, assigned to the escalation.
-

~~Subject of e-mail must be customer (Customer Name) ESCALATION (CR# if applicable) Level of Escalation~~

~~Content of e-mail must include~~

~~Definition and escalation of item~~

~~History of item~~

~~Reason for escalation~~

~~Desired outcome of customer~~

- Qwest will post escalated issue and any associated responses on the CMP web site within 1 business day of receipt of the complete escalation or response. [see action item]
- Qwest will give notification that an escalation has been requested via the Industry Mail Out process [in a time frame to be determined – Jarby]
- Any other CLEC wishing to participate in the escalation must submit an e-mail notification to the escalation URL within one (1) business day of the mail out. The subject line of the e-mail must include the title of the escalated issue followed by "ESCALATION PARTICIPATION"

~~Impact to customer of not meeting the desired outcome or item remaining on current course of action as previously discussed at the prioritization review (if escalation is associated with a change request)~~

~~Impact to customer of a rejected change request~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

- ~~Contact information for appropriate level including Name, Title, Phone Number, and e-mail ID~~
- ~~It is not necessary to repeat information for level 2 and 3 escalations. However, the e-mail submission should include any additional information since the last distribution, including the reason that the matter could not be resolved at previous level~~
- ~~The provider will reply to the escalation request with an acknowledgment of receipt within 1 business day~~
- ~~Within seven (7) calendar days of receipt, the appropriate provider change management executive (Level 1-2: Director or Level 3: Vice President) will reply through provider change management with provider position and explanation for that position~~
- As soon as practicable, but no later than fourteen (14) calendar days of sending the acknowledgement e-mail, Qwest will respond with a binding position e-mail including supporting rationale.
- The escalating ~~customer should~~ CLEC will respond to ~~the provider~~Qwest within seven (7) calendar days with a binding position e-mail. ~~as to whether escalation will continue or the provider response has been accepted as closure to the item~~
- ~~If the provider's position suggests a change in the current disposition of the item, a conference call will be held within 1 business day of the provider's decision in order to arrive at consensus with the appropriate executives~~
- ~~The provider will publish the outcome of the conference call via e-mail~~
- ~~For escalations associated with Type 1 changes, the provider has a one day turnaround rather than 5 for each cycle of escalation~~
- When the escalation is closed, the resolution will be subject to the CMP.

~~3.4.2.1 Flow of Escalation Table~~

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

INTERFACE TESTING

~~The provider~~ Qwest will provide a separate Customer Test Environment (CTE) for the testing of application-to-application interfaces for pre-order and order. There are two types of testing: new release testing and production support. New release testing provides the opportunity to test the code associated with releases for Types 2 through 5 change requests. Production support testing allows ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~providers~~ Qwest to test changes made as a result of Type 1 change request implementation.

I. *New Release & Production Support Testing in the ~~Customer~~CLEC Test Environment (CTE)*

This section provides information regarding the CTE and the procedures for new release and Production Support testing.

The CTE is a separate environment that contains the application-to-application interface and gateway applications for preordering and ordering. This environment is used for ~~customer~~CLEC testing – both new release testing and new entrant testing. ~~Customer~~CLECs are responsible for establishing and maintaining connectivity into the CTE. Provided a ~~customer~~CLEC uses the same connectivity option as it uses in production, the ~~customer~~CLEC should, in general, experience response times similar to production. However, this environment is not intended for volume testing. The CTE contains the appropriate applications for pre-ordering and Local Service Request (LSR) ordering up to and including the service order processor.

Any special procedures required due to geographical or system differences will be reviewed with the participating ~~customer~~CLEC prior to the implementation of their testing phase.

II. *New Release Testing*

New release testing is the process ~~customer~~CLECs use to test an upcoming ~~provider~~Qwest systems release that impacts the interface and business rules between ~~customer~~CLECs and ~~the provider~~Qwest.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

III. *Getting Ready for the New Release Testing*

~~Customer~~CLECs should be notified of the content of the release through the change management process. ~~Customer~~CLECs should review the content of the release and determine if they want to participate in the test and what transactions they would like to submit as part of the test.

~~The provider~~Qwest will send an industry notification, including testing schedules, to ~~customer~~CLECs so they may determine their intent to participate in the test. ~~Customer~~CLECs wishing to participate in the test should make arrangements with ~~the provider~~Qwest testing coordinator. ~~The provider~~Qwest will publish any changes to the schedule.

IV. *Production Support Testing*

Production Support testing occurs in a production like environment used in support of new entrant testing. New entrant testing is intended for those ~~customer~~CLECs that are not currently in production or that want to test new ordering or pre-ordering transactions for which they have not been through testing.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

TRAINING

All changes to existing interfaces, as well as the introduction of new interfaces, will be incorporated into ~~customer~~CLEC training.

~~Providers~~Qwest~~—~~ may conduct ~~customer~~CLEC workshops. ~~Customer~~CLEC workshops are organized and facilitated by ~~the provider~~Qwest and can serve any one of the following purposes:

- *Educate ~~customer~~CLECs on a particular process or business function*
- *Collect feedback from ~~customer~~CLECs on a particular process or business function*
- *Provide a forum for ~~providers~~Qwest or ~~customer~~CLECs to lobby for the implementation of a particular process or business function*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Dispute Resolution Process
FROM SEPTEMBER 18, 2001 REDESIGN SESSION

CLECs and Qwest will work together in good faith to resolve any issue brought before the CMP [define Good Faith]. In the event that an impasse issue develops, ~~is not resolved through the Escalation Process described in Section xx has been followed without resulting in a resolution~~, a party may pursue the dispute resolution processes set forth below:~~the dispute shall be resolved by either method set forth below.~~

- Qwest or any CLEC may suggest that the issue be resolved through an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process, such as arbitration or mediation using the American Arbitration Association (AAA) or other rules. If the parties agree to use an ADR process and agree upon the process and rules to be used, including whether the results of the ADR process are binding, the dispute will be resolved through the agreed-upon ADR process.

~~□Qwest or any CLEC affected by the dispute, may request mediation by a third party. If mediation is requested, parties shall participate in good faith. Qwest and the CLECs affected by the dispute must agree to the terms of the mediation, including the payment of costs and fees. If the mediation results in the resolution of the dispute, that resolution shall apply to all CLECs affected by the dispute. If mediation is not successful in resolving the issue, Qwest or any CLEC may use the process set forth below.[action item for proposed language]~~

- Without the necessity for a prior ADR Process~~[contingent on first bullet]~~, Qwest or any CLEC may submit the issue, following the commission's established procedures, with the appropriate regulatory agency requesting resolution of the dispute. This provision is not intended to change the scope of any regulatory agency's authority with regard to Qwest or the CLECs.

~~However,~~ T~~t~~his process does not limit any party's right to seek remedies in a regulatory or legal arena at any time.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Term	*Definition*
~~CUSTOMER~~ CLEC	*Party originating a request (LSR)*

INTERFACE	*A mechanism to communicate between ~~customer~~CLEC/provider or trading partners (e.g., paper, GUI, gateway)*
	• *A new interface is ~~the provider~~Qwest's introduction of paper, GUI, gateway, etc., to all ~~customer~~CLECs for the first time.*
	• *A change to an interface may include:*
	  • *Paper to GUI*
	  • *Changes of EDI to CORBA*

ISSUE	*The specific OBF LSOG Issue (e.g., Local Services Ordering Guidelines (LSOG) document, Issue 5, August 2000)*
PROVIDER	*Party receiving request (LSR)*
RELEASE	*Implementation of version (Type 3 change) using a particular interface. A release may include enhancements or customization (Type 1,2,4 or 5 change) to an LSOG version by a provider as well as ~~customer~~CLEC/provider business requirements.*
VERSION	*The supported OBF LSOG Issue (e.g., Local Services Ordering Guidelines (LSOG) document, Issue 5, August 2000)* *(Type 3 change)*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

ANSI	*American National Standards Institute*
ATIS	*Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions*
CMP	*Change Management Process*
ECIC	*Electronic Communications Implementation Committee*
EDI	*Electronic Data Interchange*
FCC	*Federal Communications Commission*
GUI	*Graphical User Interface*
ITU	*International Telecommunications Union*
LOI	*Letter of Intent*
LSR	*Local Service Request*
NRIC	*Network Reliability and Interoperability Council*
OBF	*Ordering and Billing Forum*
OIS	*Outstanding Issue Solution*
OSS	*Operational Support Systems*
POC	*Point Of Contact*
RN	*Release Notification*
TCIF	*Telecommunications Industry Forum*

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

APPENDIX A: CHANGE REQUEST FORM AND CHECKLIST

I. *Appendix A-1: Change Request Form*

---

(1) Internal Reference # _____ *(2) Date Change Request Submitted* ___/___/___

(3) ☐ ***TYPE 1 (EMERGENCY)*** *(4)* ☐ ***TYPE 2 (REGULATORY)*** *(5)* ☐ ***TYPE 3 (INDUSTRY)***
- ☐ *Severity 1 (stops production)*
- ☐ *Severity 2 (impacts production)*
- ☐ *Severity 3 (major w/work around)*

(6) ☐ ***TYPE 4 (PROVIDER)*** *(7)* ☐ ***TYPE 5 (~~CUSTOMER~~CLEC)***

(4) ~~Customer~~CLEC _____

(5) Originator _____ *(6) Phone* _____

(7) Originator's Email Address _____ *(8) Fax* _____

(9) Alternate Contact _____ *(10) Alt Phone #* _____

(11) Title of Change _____

(12) ***Category*** ☐ *Add New Functionality* ☐ *Change Existing*

(13) ***Interfaces Impacted***
- ☐ *Pre-Ordering*
- ☐ *Ordering*
- ☐ *Maintenance*
- ☐ *Manual*
- ☐ *Billing*
- ☐ *Business Rules*
- ☐ *Other*

(14) Description of requested change including purpose and benefit received from this change. (Use additional sheets, if necessary.)

_____
_____
_____
_____

(15) Known dependencies

_____
_____

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

(16) List all business specifications and/or requirements documents included (or Internet / Standards location, if applicable)

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

This Section to be completed by Provider ONLY.

*(17) Change Request Log #*_____ *(18) Clarification* ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*

(19) Clarification Request Sent ___/___/___ *(20) Clarification Response Due* ___/___/___

(21) Status _____

(22) Change Request Review Date __/__/__ *(23) Target Implementation Date* ___/___/__

(24) Last Modified By _____ *(25) Date Modified* ___/___/___

(26) ***Change Request Activity***

_____

_____

_____

_____

(27) ***Rejected Change Request***

- ☐ *Cost/benefits*
- ☐ *Resource commitments*
- ☐ *Industry or regulatory direction*
- ☐ *Provider direction*
- ☐ *Other*

_____

_____

(28) Cancellation Acknowledgment ~~Customer~~CLEC _____ *Provider*_____ *Date* ___/___/___

(29) ***Request Escalation*** ☐ *Yes* ☐ *No*

(30) ***Escalation Considerations***

_____

_____

_____

_____

(31) ***Agreed Release Date*** ___/___/___

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

This section to be completed by Provider – Internal Validation of Defect Change Request.
(32) ***Defect Validation Results:***

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

II. *Appendix A-2: Change Request Form Checklist*

All fields will be validated before Change Request is returned for clarification.

Field	Checklist	Description	Instructions	Action Required
1	Optional	Optional field for the initiator to use for internal tracking. The request may be generated prior to submission into ~~the Provider~~Qwest's change control process.	No action	
2	Mandatory	Date Change Request sent to Provider.	Return to Sender	Date entry required
3	Mandatory	Indicate type of Change Request: ~~Customer~~CLEC or Provider initiated Industry Standard or Regulatory.	Return to Sender	Company designation required
4	Mandatory	Enter company name for the Change Request.	Return to Sender	Company name required
5	Mandatory	Enter originating company's Change Control Initiator's name.	Return to Sender	Initiator's name required
6	Mandatory	Enter originating company's Change Control Initiator's phone number.	Return to Sender	Initiator's phone number required
7	Mandatory	Enter originating company's Change Control Initiator's Email address.	Return to Sender	Initiator's Email address required
8	Mandatory	Enter originating company's Change Control Initiator's fax number.	Return to Sender	Initiator's fax number required
9	Mandatory	Enter originating company's alternate contact name.	Return to Sender	Alternate contact name required
10	Mandatory	Enter originating company's alternate contact phone number.	Return to Sender	Alternate contact number required
11	Mandatory	For the purpose of referencing the Change Request, assign a short, but descriptive name.	Return to Sender	Title required – maximum length 40 characters.
12	Mandatory	Identify request category for the Change Request.	Return to Sender	Category required
13	Mandatory	Identify originating company assessment of impact	Return to Sender	Entry required
14	Mandatory	Describe the proposed Change Request, indicating the purpose and benefit of request. If additional space is needed, use additional sheet.	Return to Sender	Description of Change Request required
15	Mandatory	Indicate any known dependencies relative to the Change Request. If none are known, enter "None known".	Return to Sender	Entry required

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Field	Checklist	Description	Instructions	Action Required
16	Mandatory	*Indicate whether additional information accompanies/supports the proposed Change Request If yes, list all documents attached or reference where they can be found, including internet address and standards reference, if applicable.*	*Return to Sender*	*Supporting documentation must accompany request*
17	Mandatory Provider	*A Change Request Log Number generated by the "Change Request Logging system" upon receipt of the Change Request. The number should be sent back to the initiator on the acknowledgment receipt. This # will be used to track the Change Request.*	*Return to Sender*	*Log number – system generated*
18	ConditionalProvider	*Indicates whether clarification is needed on the Change Request.*	*Return to Sender*	
19	ConditionalProvider	*Date clarification request sent to Initiator.*		
20	ConditionalProvider	*Date clarification due back from Initiator.*	*Return to Sender*	
21	Mandatory Provider	*Indicate status of proposed Change Request (i.e., clarification, validation, pending, etc)*		
22	Mandatory Provider	*Assign date when Change Request will appear on agenda.*	*Return to Sender*	
23	Mandatory Provider	*A soft date for implementation. Updated based on Candidate Release Package info.*		
24	Mandatory Provider	*Field that communicates who last updated the request.*		
25	Mandatory Provider	*Field that communicates when the last update occurred.*		
26	Mandatory Provider	*Change Request results captured from the Change Review meeting.*		
27	Conditional Provider	*Cancelled Change Request reasoning.*	*Return to Sender*	
28	Conditional Provider	*Concurrence with Change Request originating company. Show date of concurrence.*	*Return to Sender*	
29	Conditional Provider	*Change Request Escalation indication.*		
30	Conditional Provider	*Detailed description of the escalation considerations.*		

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Field	Checklist	Description	Instructions	Action Required
31	*Mandatory Provider*	*Indicate agreed release date from Project Release Plan.*		
32	*Mandatory Provider*	*Results of Internal Defect Validation*		

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

APPENDIX B: CHANGE REQUEST PRIORITIZATION FORM

Item #	*Change Request #*	*Description of Change Request*	*~~Customer~~CLEC Rankings*	*Comments*
		Title: ***Description:*** ***Process:*** ***System:*** ***Primary Area:*** ***LSOG Version:*** ***Initiator/Date:***	*Overall =* *Cust #1 =* *Cust #2 =* *Cust #3 =* *Cust #4 =* *Cust #5 =* *Cust #6 =*	
		Title: ***Description:*** ***Process:*** ***System:*** ***Primary Area:*** ***LSOG Version:*** ***Initiator/Date:***	*Overall =* *Cust #1 =* *Cust #2 =* *Cust #3 =* *Cust #4 =* *Cust #5 =* *Cust #6 =*	
		Title: ***Description:*** ***Process:*** ***System:*** ***Primary Area:*** ***LSOG Version:*** ***Initiator/Date:***	*Overall =* *Cust #1 =* *Cust #2 =* *Cust #3 =* *Cust #4 =* *Cust #5 =* *Cust #6 =*	

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

APPENDIX C: CMP PRIORITIZATION PROCESS EXAMPLE

Example: *Change Request E2 is prioritized highest. Since E3 and E5 are tied, they will be re-ranked and prioritized according to the re-ranking.*

Pre-order	*~~Customer~~CLEC #1*	*~~Customer~~CLEC #2*	*~~Customer~~CLEC #3*	*TOTAL*	*Average*
E1	*5*	*5*	*5*	*15*	*5*
E2	*1*	*2*	*1*	*4*	*1*
E3	*3*	*1*	*5*	*9*	*3*
E4	*5*	*3*	*4*	*12*	*4*
E5	*2*	*5*	*2*	*9*	*3*
E6	*4*	*4*	*3*	*11*	*4*

1232951/67817.150

[1] Throughout this document, OSS Interfaces are defined as gateways (including application-to-application interfaces and Graphical User Interfaces), connectivity and system functions that support or affect the pre-order, order, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing capabilities that are provided to CLECs.

[2] Throughout this document, the terms "include(s)" and "including" mean "including, but not limited to."

Note-Throughout this document italicized text represents OBF language not yet discussed by the CLEC-Qwest Re-Design Team.

Qwest CMP SGAT Proposed Language

12.2.6 Change Management(Updated at 9-20-01 Redesign Session)

Qwest agrees to maintain a change management process, known as the Change Management Process (CMP), that is consistent with industry guidelines, standards and practices to address ~~. Qwest and CLEC shall participate in discussions of~~ OSS, products and processes. ~~development in CMP.~~ The CMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (i) provide a forum for CLEC and Qwest to discuss CLEC and Qwest change requests (CR), release notifications (RN), systems release life cycles, and communications; (ii) provide a forum for CLECs as an industry to discuss and prioritize ~~CLEC-initiated and Qwest-initiated~~ CRs; (iii) develop a mechanism to track and monitor CRs and RNs; and (iv) establish ~~communication~~ intervals where appropriate in the process. Pursuant to the procedures set forth in Exhibit G, Qwest will submit to ~~inform~~ CLECs through the CMP of modifications to the structure of existing products and product and technical documentation available to CLECs, introduction of new products available to CLECs, discontinuance of products available to CLECs, modifications to pre-ordering, ordering/provisioning, maintenance/repair or billing processes which change CLEC operating procedures, introduction of pre-ordering, ordering/provisioning, maintenance/repair or billing processes which change CLEC operating procedures, discontinuance of pre-ordering, ordering/provisioning, maintenance/repair or billing processes which change CLEC operating procedures, modifications to existing OSS interfaces, introduction of new OSS interfaces, and retirement of existing OSS interfaces. ~~Qwest will seek CLEC input on the planned changes and will report such consideration in a timely manner.~~ Qwest will maintain an escalation process so that CMP issues can be escalated to a Qwest representative authorized to make a final decision and a process for resolution of disputes. The governing document for CMP, known as the "CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process" is attached as Exhibit G. As of the date of filing, the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process document (Exhibit G) is the subject of ongoing negotiations between Qwest and CLECs in the ongoing CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process. Not all of the sections of Exhibit G have been discussed or considered during the ongoing CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process, and the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process document will be continue to be changed through those discussions. Exhibit G reflects the commitments Qwest has made regarding maintaining its CMP as of the date of filing, and Qwest commits to implement agreements made in the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Redesign process as soon as practicable after they are made. Following the completion of the CLEC-Qwest Change Management process, Exhibit G will be subject to change through the CMP process. Qwest will maintain the most current version of the CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process document on its wholesale website.
~~Exhibit G is subject to revision through the Change Management Process.~~

12.2.6.1 In the course of establishing operational ready system interfaces between Qwest and CLEC to support local service delivery, CLEC and Qwest may need to define and implement system interface specifications that are supplemental to existing standards. CLEC and Qwest will submit such specifications to the appropriate standards committee and will work towards their acceptance as standards.

12.2.6.2 Release updates will be implemented pursuant to the Change Management Process set forth in Exhibit G.