

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
1	BI-1	Qwest	Add exclusion for duplicate records	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BI-1 measures the timeliness with which Qwest provides recorded daily usage records to CLECs. Original records are what is properly measured and of value to the CLEC. Credit for providing two records (original and duplicate) should not be taken. Also, duplicate records do not impact the time in which the original records are sent; and therefore, should be excluded. 	1/8 – Parties agreed to the proposal.	1/8 – Closed
2	BI-3A	Qwest	Replace parity standard with a benchmark (Red-Line PID attached.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benchmark is a more appropriate standard than parity. When volumes are large and the results are close to 100% accurate, very small differences between retail and wholesale results may be deemed to be statistically significant, but not discriminatory on a practical level. The performance results for BI-3A fit this situation. A benchmark is better suited to ensure a more predictable level of targeted performance month after month. - In addition, a benchmark is a better standard because there are inherent differences between retail and wholesale adjustment types, as to products, type, timing and volumes. - Retail & wholesale products can be significantly different. Retail adjustments are primarily based on standardized tariffed offerings. Wholesale adjustments are based on contracts with a number of individually negotiated terms. Regarding types of adjustments, retail frequently adjusts toll charges, while wholesale adjusts very few. Retail typically issues as few as one or two adjustments per customer; wholesale adjustments often address a large number of adjustments per customer. 	1/8 – Qwest will present its benchmark proposal in 3 weeks.	1/8 -- Open

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
				- For these reasons, comparing wholesale and retail billing adjustments is an apples-to-oranges comparison that is better addressed by a benchmark.		
3	BI-3A	Qwest	Clarify the wording in the formula: change from "Revenue Billed without Error" to "Total Billed Revenue billed in Reporting Period minus Amounts Adjusted Off Bills Due to Errors." Changes reflected in the red-lined version of the PID referenced above.	- This is a wording change that is easier to understand and consistent with industry language. It does not change the formula itself.	1/8 – Tentative agreement, MCI reviewing with billing SME.	1/8 Tentative Agreement
4	BI-5	Qwest	Propose a modified PID for Billing Claims Processing. Qwest has been reporting a version of this proposed PID voluntarily since August, 2002 and now seeks approval of this PID modification. (Red-Line PID attached.)	- This PID would evaluate the promptness with which Qwest acknowledges and resolves CLEC billing adjustment claims processed in the Service Delivery Center.	1/8 – Qwest provided a brief overview of its proposal and CLECs will respond in 2 weeks. Qwest will change "responded" to "acknowledge" in the BI-5A disaggregation reporting category. Finally, Qwest will review its business process to determine how to implement the "Legally disputed claims" exclusion.	1/8 -- Open
5	Billing (including, but not limited to BI-5)	Eschelon US Link	A discussion of Qwest's billing accuracy is necessary.	Qwest's wholesale bills are inadequate as evidenced by Qwest's own BI-3 reporting. Qwest has proposed that LTPA address this. Eschelon agrees that a broad discussion of billing issues is necessary.	1/8 – Qwest agreed to provide Eschelon with two audit reports on billing adjustments. Based on this material, Eschelon agreed to document its concerns in greater detail.	1/8 -- Open
6	Qwest request to add BI-5	MCI	Qwest had or circulated a draft of a metric for comments on 8/8/02. MCI responded on 8/22/02 with comments. This issue has never been discussed in detail in ad hoc LTPA.		1/8 – See Issue no. 4.	1/8 -- Open
					10/13 – Issue is the same as Proposal 8 so issue is deleted.	

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
8	Line Loss PID	AT&T, MCI, US Link, and Eschelon	Qwest's timely and accurate notice of CLEC customer losses should be measured	Only Qwest knows that a resale or UNE-P customer has left. Qwest is required to provide notice of CLEC losses because, without timely and accurate line loss notifications, CLECs will continue to bill customers served by another carrier. Qwest's performance is inadequate. Qwest's performance should be measured and ultimately included in the PAPs.		
9	MR-7	Qwest	Modify MR-7 to be forward-looking – similar to the new OP-5 measurement – rather than backward-looking. (Red-Line PID attached.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Both OP-5 and MR-7 began as backward-looking measurements. OP-5 was recently improved by modifying it to be forward-looking. The proposal is to similarly modify MR-7 to be forward looking, thereby improving the measurement by focusing on the quality of original repairs in the reporting month. – The current MR-7 looks for repeat repairs in the reporting month by looking for original repairs either in the reporting month or the prior month – backward-looking. With this method, there is potential for a mismatch between repairs counted in the numerator and those in the denominator (because some repairs counted in the numerator may be repeats of repairs in the prior month, which are not reflected in the denominator), distorting the measurement. – The proposed MR-7 looks at original repairs in the reporting month, and then looks for repeat repairs over a subsequent 30-day period – forward-looking. With this method, repairs in the numerator would match up with those in the denominator, improving the measurement. Results would be reported one month in arrears. 	<p>12/11 – Conceptual agreement by the parties. Qwest agreed to use old data and present the results under the existing method and the new proposal.</p> <p>1/8 – Qwest will provide this analysis by the end of Jan.</p>	<p>12/11 – Open</p> <p>1/8 -- Open</p>
10	MR-8	Qwest	Discussion around potential alignment of numerator (repair tickets) and denominator (lines	– Repair tickets compared to a snapshot of lines in service at a given date may not be the optimal method of measuring	12/11 – According to Qwest, there is an anomaly in this PID that results in overstating Qwest's ownership of lines.	

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
			in service)	trouble report rate.	This Issue will be revisited in January after Qwest provides more detail regarding the anomaly.	
10a	MR-3, 4, 5, 6	Eschelon	The phrase "of receipt" should be changed to "that Qwest is first notified of the trouble by CLEC" in the Description sections of these PIDs.	The intent of these PIDs is to measure the entire amount of time that a customer is out of service. The proposed changes are necessary to better reflect the repair interval.		
10b	MR-3 and 4	Eschelon	Delete the phrase "indicted as" in the second bullet point in the Description section.	To be consistent with MR-5 and 6.		
11	Benchmark standards for DS1 capable loops in OP-3 and OP-4	Eschelon US Link	Change DS1 capable loop standards to benchmarks for OP-3 and OP-4	Qwest's retail and wholesale installation intervals are not comparable. When no retail analogue exists, benchmark standards are necessary to evaluate whether CLECs have a meaningful opportunity to compete.		
12	OP-4, -6 & 15	Qwest	Add OP-3 exclusion language for non-Qwest reasons to OP-4, -6 & -15 (Red-Lined PIDs for OP-4, -6 & -15 attached.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OP-3 recognizes that events outside of Qwest's control are validly excluded, i.e. weather, disasters, work stoppage. While this PID explicitly recognizes this exclusion, the current language in OP-4, -6 & -15 is silent on these non-Qwest reasons. They only delineate CLEC/customer caused misses. This change is simply to make the language of OP-4, -6 & 15 as explicit as OP-3. 		
13	OP-3, -4, -5, -6, & 15 and MR-3, -4, -5, -6, -7, -8 & -9	Qwest	Develop volume thresholds that determine changes in product reporting categories. Factors include both new installations volumes and total in service by state.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adding or subtracting products over an appropriate period of time will ensure that important products are reported. It also will ensure that reporting resources are wisely spent. 	<p>11/13 – Issue related to Proposal 33 and will be discussed on Dec. 11</p> <p>12/18 – After discussing the proposal by Qwest and the response by CLECs, Qwest agreed to determine if xDSL-i loops are included in OP, PO and MR PIDs. Qwest also agreed to provide a "cheat sheet" of which LSRs are included in PIDs, Qwest will also provide an example of the timeline that would be used to begin reporting on a new product.</p> <p>1/8 – In 2 weeks, CLECs will submit a</p>	<p>12/18 – Open</p> <p>1/8 -- Open</p>

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
					revised proposal based on volume growth rather than a bright line threshold as proposed by Qwest. At the same time, Qwest will review its proposal focusing on its ability to report disaggregations for existing products faster than for new products. See Issue 32 for the discussion of xDSL-I loops.	
14	OP-3, -4, -5, -6, & 15 and MR-3, -4, -5, -6, -7, -8 & -9	Qwest	Determine product disaggregations according to same/similar underlying process and standard intervals. E.g. Resale Qwest DSL follows design and non-design repair, currently all reported under Zone type. Propose creation of reporting categories in MSA disaggregation as in installation measurements.	- This will simplify reporting, make reports more manageable but retain a meaningful aggregation of products.		
14a	Sub-loop OP-3/4/5/6/15, MR-3/4/6/7/8	USLink	Set standards for sub-loop where currently diagnostic.	Colorado currently has standards for some. USLink would like to see standards in all states. -		
14b	OP-17 MR-3, MR-4, MR-6, MR-7, MR-8, MR-9, and MR-11.	Qwest	Modify OP-17 by inserting "provisioning" before the term "trouble report". Modify various MR PIDs by inserting "repair" before the term "trouble report."	Revised language provides greater consistency and was negotiated by the industry as part of OP-5.	12/4 – Issue discussed as administrative cleanup. Eschelon disagreed with this administrative change and requested separate discussions. Issue scheduled for discussion on Dec. 11. 12/11 – Qwest has withdrawn this proposal. Eschelon is concerned that Qwest is not capturing trouble reports for new installations. Eschelon may propose a new PID or modifications to existing PIDs.	12/4 – Open 12/11 Withdrawn
15	PO-1	Qwest	Adopt AZ benchmarks for the 9th and 10th Pre-Order transactions: - Connecting Facility	- Initial 6 month reporting period ended. - Issue went to impasse in Arizona and Qwest is willing to accept the standards adopted in AZ but should CLECs prefer		

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
			Assignment - 25 seconds – Meet Point Inquiry - 30 seconds (Red-Line PID attached.)	no standard at this time leave as TBD. – Synchronize benchmark with AZ standard		
15a	PO-1	Qwest	Delete the first note.	– LTPA forum should be used to expand the list of reported transactions.	12/4 – Issue discussed as administrative clean-up but was determined to be substantive in nature. Future discussions are planned for Dec. 11. 12/11 – Qwest agreed to retain this footnote.	12/4 – Open 12/11 – Closed.
16	PO-2	Qwest	Propose inclusion of UNE-P Ctx 21 and line sharing in PO-2; diagnostic for 1 st 6 months, with consideration at the end of 6 months whether to add to an existing product reporting category. 1. Create new product disaggregation for UNE-P Centrex 21 2. Create new product disaggregation for Line Sharing only.	– MN Commission directed Qwest to submit a proposal to LTPA by 11-6-03. – Propose separate reporting and diagnostic for 1 st 6 months to provide history needed to set benchmark		
17	PO-2 & PO-5	Qwest	Discussion around whether a diagnostic standard would be appropriate for PO-2 and PO-5, when results for product families are meeting standards in OP-3	– CLEC behavior impacts flow-through and flow-through exceptions do not directly correlate to problems with commitments met and intervals. – Qwest's ability to flow through LSRs does not affect our ability to provision accurately, return FOC on time, or turn up on time. As long as Qwest is meeting standards in OP-3, flow through and FOC intervals have not negatively impacted the customer experience. – PO-20 and the new OP-5 will capture accuracy issues related to orders that do not flow-through.		
18	PO-5	Covad	Further disaggregate PO-5 for all product categories to report	1. The SIG forms the basis for the intervals contained in the PIDs. However, the SIG		

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
			out disconnect and provisioning FOCs separately	<p>identifies different standards for provisioning and disconnect FOCs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Inclusion of both types of FOCs in one product category permits Qwest to mask poor performance in one type of activity by including it with another. 3. Disconnect and provisioning FOCs serve very different purposes and should be reported and evaluated separately. 		
19	PO-8	Qwest	Delete measurement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When PO-8 was created Qwest's process for CLEC jeopardy notices was not adequate. As a result of the inadequate process, the parties determined the need for both an interval and a percentage measurement. Since then, Qwest has developed a robust jeopardy process for CLECs that exceeds retail service (See PO-9 results for last 6 months) - Qwest believes the critical measurement capturing customer impact for CLECs is PO-9, which measures Qwest's performance in providing jeopardy notices in advance of the due date compared to retail. - CLEC ordering habits are different than our retail customers. CLECs tend to order more in the 2 week or less timeframe, whereas, retail customers tend to place orders further in advance of when they need the service. This is especially true for new development areas (sometimes over a year in advance.) Including the extended intervals in the retail comparative prohibits a meaningful comparison of retail to wholesale intervals. - Even with these mitigating factors included in the results, the actual PO-8 performance over the last several months does not portray a competitively 		

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
				<p>significant difference between retail and wholesale. E.g. Differences under a day are not competitively significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elimination will ensure that reporting resources are wisely spent. 		
20	PO-10	Qwest	Delete measurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This measurement was initially included with the idea that, in the six-month review, it would be removed absent evidence that Qwest's processes were failing to account for LSRs. (See Note in existing PID) - Qwest has systems in place to prevent problems in this area. - Results over the last 12 months have been 100%, 11 of 12 months; 99.99% in Oct 02. - Elimination will ensure that reporting resources are wisely spent. 		
21	PO-15	Qwest	Delete measurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This PID was created at a point more than 4 years ago when the business process did not have sufficient control around due date changes. Those business processes have been improved so it is no longer necessary. - OP-3 measures to "applicable due date." Qwest caused due date changes are accounted for in OP-3. No additional measurement is needed. - Due date changes do not necessarily impact customers negatively. For example, if Qwest completes work early and gains customer approval to change the due date and close the order, the customer experience is enhanced. - Elimination will ensure that reporting resources are wisely spent. 		
22	PO-19		Propose AZ version that includes PO-19B. Reorder the notes, Add sunset clause to the exclusion related to separate prioritization of SATE and IMA releases in CMP. Add language in Note clarifying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PO-19B is being reported but has not been approved and incorporated into the 14 state PID. 		

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
			when product activity combinations will be communicated. (Red-Line PID attached.)			
23	PO-20	Qwest	Finalize PID language for pending PO-20 Phase 1 (Propose continuing development in adhoc meetings)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing measurement is an interim measurement. - Eliminate manual review of a sample of orders. 	11/13 – Parties agree to continue negotiations (for the near future) in Ad hoc group. Final resolution will be presented to the LTPA	
24	PO-20	MCI Eschelon	<p>MCI is ok with Commission Staffs recommendation that the ongoing discussions on OP-20 be incorporated into this review session.</p> <p>In addition, if agree on measure and standards MCI would support collaboration between parties to see if can agree on PAP Tier and weighting.</p>	Ease and efficiency to having one forum.	11/13 – See Proposal 23	
25	Line Splitting (PO-5, OP-3/4/5/6/15, MR-3/4/6/7/8)	MCI Covad	Request is to add Line Splitting as a separate product category to all measures where Line Sharing is currently included.	<p>MCI -- Simply, Line Splitting is a Qwest product offering that CLECs are ordering through out the region and therefore, Qwest should provide performance reporting on this product so that CLECs and the states can monitor Qwest's ability to provide this service offering. Line Splitting should be a separate product category and not combined with Line Sharing where poor performance for one product may be masked by combining the service results. MCI would accept the same standards be applied as Line Sharing. In Colorado, Qwest required to report performance results separately for majority of measures.</p> <p>Covad -- Qwest is required and does provide these products. Therefore, Qwest should be required to report on them, particularly as the importance and order volumes for these products is and will grow.</p>	<p>12/18 – This proposal does not apply to OP-5. Parties agreed to delete the term "Shared Loop" from the shared loop-line sharing disaggregation. Qwest to determine how long it will take to begin reporting results.</p> <p>1/8 – For OP and MR PIDs, Qwest will report results in Feb. reflecting activity back to Sept. 03 except for OP-5, which will reflect activity back to Nov. 03. Also, Qwest will make a modification to PO-5 to include line splitting in product category (b) – Unbundled Loops and Specified UNES.</p>	12/18 – Closed Agreed
26	Loop Splitting	MCI	Request is to add Loop	MCI -- This to is a Qwest product offering	12/18 – Qwest asserted that they have	12/18 – Open

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
	(PO-5, OP-3/4/5/6/15, MR-3/4/6/7/8)	Covad	Splitting as a separate product category to all measures where Line Sharing is currently included.	and to the extent that CLEC's order this service Qwest should provide performance reporting on this product so that CLECs and the states can monitor Qwest's ability to provide this service offering. Loop Splitting should be a separate product category and not combined with Line Sharing or Line Splitting as well. MCI could consider using the same standard used for line sharing but is open for discussion on the appropriate standard. Covad -- Qwest is required and does provide these products. Therefore, Qwest should be required to report on them, particularly as the importance and order volumes for these products is and will grow.	zero lines in service and therefore there is nothing to report. Covad and MCI will review their proposal and may offer an alternative. 1/8 – See Issue 13. The volume threshold discussion directly affects this issue.	1/8 --- Open
27	Line Sharing and Line Splitting OP-6, OP-15 and OP-5	MCI Covad	Request that standard be set where currently listed as diagnostic.	MCI -- Have had sufficient reporting of Line Sharing and volumes are increasing for Line Splitting and standard should be developed as it has for the majority of the other products and other measures under Line Sharing. Covad -- A "diagnostic" standard is no longer appropriate because Qwest has had ample experience and order volume to establish an appropriate standard.	12/18 – Covad and MCI offered the following two alternative standards: 1. Parity with Qwest DSL service or: 2. Parity with Res/Bus POTs This proposal applies to line sharing and line splitting for both OP-6 and OP-15. It only applies to line splitting for OP-5 1/8 – Qwest is still reviewing the proposal.	12/18 – Open 1/8 -- Open
28	PO-5	Covad	Establish standards for line splitting and loop splitting product categories.	Qwest is required and does provide these products. Therefore, Qwest should be required to report on them, particularly as the importance and order volumes for these products is and will grow. Additionally, not only is reporting required, but Qwest should be held to a performance standard so that it not hamper competitors' ability to compete. Because of the identity of technical and provisioning processes between line sharing and line splitting, and the even greater ease from a technical perspective of provisioning loop splitting, the line sharing standards should be adopted for line and loop splitting.	1/8 – See Issue 26 for Loop Splitting. Issue is closed for Line Splitting.	1/8 – Closed for Line Splitting. Open for Loop Splitting.

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
29	OP-3, 4, 5, 6, 15, MR-3, 4, 6, 7, 8	Covad	Establish standards for line splitting and loop splitting product categories.	Qwest is required and does provide these products. Therefore, Qwest should be required to report on them, particularly as the importance and order volumes for these products is and will grow. Additionally, not only is reporting required, but Qwest should be held to a performance standard so that it not hamper competitors' ability to compete. Because of the identity of technical and provisioning processes between line sharing and line splitting, and the even greater ease from a technical perspective of provisioning loop splitting, the line sharing standards should be adopted for line and loop splitting.	1/8 – See Issue 26 for Loop Splitting. Qwest recommends using 6 months of reported data to establish the standard for Line Splitting. This data will be available at the end of March. Covad recommends beginning the discussion now and not wait until the end of March. Parties have agreed to use 4 months of reported data (which will be available at the end of Feb.) as the starting point for negotiating a standard. Covad will review the data and offer a proposal on the first LTPA call after data is reported.	1/8 -- Open
30	OP-5 subcategories	Covad	Evaluation of standards for line sharing and loop splitting.	As a result of discussions in the ad hoc LTPA, certain standards for line sharing were established for the OP-5 subcategories. At that time, no standards were established for line splitting because of the lack of order volume. However, in light of additional experience with eh OP-5 subcategories for line sharing, and because Qwest is regularly provisioning line splitting orders, the parties should evaluate the standards (or lack thereof) set for line sharing and line splitting for the OP-5 subcategories.	1/8 –Two months of data for Line Splitting will be available in Feb. Parties have agreed to use the process outlined in Issue 29 but discuss the standard for OP-5 at the end.	1/8 -- Open
31	EELs (PO-5, OP-3/4/5/6, MR-5/6/7/8.	MCI Eschelon US Link	Request that standard be set where currently listed as diagnostic.	MCI -- In Colorado the parties entered into a stipulation that was accepted by the Colorado Commission and standards for EELs were accepted into the PAP. This issue of standards for EELs was also brought up in the Washington PAP review. Qwest's response was that "this is a PID standard issue and should be discussed in LTPA". MCI would be willing to agree to the same standards the parties agreed to in Colorado. Eschelon -- The FCC and state commissions have recognized the importance of EELs. Some states have ordered standards. LTPA should adopt		

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
				similar standards for EELs.		
32	xDSL-I under various PIDs	Eschelon US Link	xDSL-i capable loop product reporting should be added to existing measures.	Product currently not measured under PIDs. Product has been available and ordered for at least 2 years.	1/8 – Qwest stated that xDSL-I loops are reported in 15 PIDs. A list of these PIDs will be provided by Qwest. Qwest also opposes reporting this product because it does not meet its volume threshold level. Qwest and Eschelon have different volume numbers and agreed to work off-line to reconcile the data.	1/8 -- Open
33	Products not currently reported under existing PIDs; development of a general approach.	Eschelon	LTPA should establish a general presumption that each product that Qwest offers should be measured under existing PIDs. For unmeasured products introduced prior to November 1, 2003, Qwest should be required to identify products and availability for measurement to LTPA by January 1, 2004. For products introduced after November 1, 2003, Qwest should be required to measure its performance within 30 days of product availability.	Since the PIDs were developed, Qwest has made additional products and capabilities available. For example, products such as Centrex 21 and line sharing are now flow-through eligible. However, Qwest does not measure whether these orders actually flow through in PO-2. It has already been determined that Qwest's performance should be measured in key areas (e.g., ordering, provision, etc.). It has already been determined that Qwest must provide these products in a non-discriminatory manner under state and federal law. Qwest should measure its performance under existing metrics. LTPA will determine appropriate standards.	11/13 – Issue related to Proposal 13 and will be discussed on Dec. 11	
34	Tier Designation	Eschelon	LTPA should discuss Tier designations for new PIDs.	As part of the discussion of PID additions, parties should identify their positions on Tier designations for PAP purposes. For example, Eschelon has proposed that PO-20 be treated the same as OP-5 under the Washington PAP as part of that Commission's six-month review once PO-20 is finalized. If other parties can agree on issues like this, there will be fewer issues to address in 14 separate state reviews.		
35a	Administrative clean-up of PID documentation	Qwest	Provide a redlined version of the PID that addresses various administrative categories for input from the LTPA participants.	To increase completeness, accuracy, consistency, and understandability of the PID document. Categories include: – Correct typographical or administrative errors:	11/13 – Issue will be discussed on Dec. 4 12/4 – Issue divided between administrative clean-up (35a) and inconsistencies (35b). Issue 35b will be discussed at a later time. Qwest will	12/4 – Open 1/8 –Closed, pending completion of various action

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g.: For PO-16, the wrong PID draft was used to update the 14-state Version 5.0 PID and some of the redlined changes were inadvertently omitted from the document. Would replace with correct draft. - Remove and archive outdated information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g.: Remove or modify information in the Notes and Availability sections that refer to activities that occurred more than twelve months ago and are no longer meaningful to the current Performance Measurement reports (e.g., OP-3). - Increase consistency of language with underlying process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g.: For OP-3, OP-4, & OP-6, remove "Unbundled Loop – Analog (non-designed)" from the Product Reporting section under MSA-Type Disaggregation because all analog loops go through the designed provisioning process (i.e., Zone-Type Disaggregation). - Increase consistency of language among PIDs and/or with other regulatory documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g.: For OP-3, OP-4, OP-5, OP-6, OP-15, MR-5, MR-6, MR-7, MR-8, & Glossary of Acronyms, change "Enhanced Extended Links" to "Enhanced Extended Loops" to be consistent with other regulatory-based documents (e.g., SGATs, SIGs). ▪ E.g., For OP-17, some of the MRs, and NI-1, change "trouble report" to "provisioning trouble report" or "repair trouble report" 	<p>attempt to respond to issues raised by various parties by Dec. 11. Two issues were considered substantive and will be discussed on Dec. 11. The first involves a proposal by Qwest to delete the first note in PO1 (See Issue 15a) The second involves a proposal by Qwest to modify the term "trouble reports." (See issue 14b) All proposals were agreed-to except for proposals with outstanding action items and issues deferred for separate discussions.</p> <p>12/11 – Qwest responded to the 12/4 action items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Qwest agreed to post the June 2002 version of the PIDs and all subsequent updates to the PIDs on its web site. Older, individual versions of the PIDs will be sent to CLECs upon request but will not be posted to the web site. 2. In lieu of including PAP-specific standards in the PIDs, CLECs offered to include a footnote at the beginning to indicate that other measures and/or standards may be included in state PAPs. Qwest to review this proposal. 3. Qwest agreed to modify Ex. B of the SGAT to correct errors (e.g., GA -1 to remove 1B and 1C and add 1D and PO-16). Qwest to circulate red-line PIDs by 12/15. On the next call parties will determine if administrative changes (Issue 35a) should be included in these various state filings. 4. Qwest agreed to reinsert PO-1A 6 in the disaggregation reporting section. 5. Qwest provided the dates when LLS was removed from DB-1. 	<p>items.</p>

PID Six-Month Review Collaborative

Master Issues Matrix
As Of: 1/8/04

Proposal Number	PID# or Subject	Proposed By (Who)	Proposal (What)	Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Alternative Proposal/Position	Status Of Proposal
				<p>as applicable to be consistent with OP-5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase consistency of content within sections among PIDs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g.: In the Exclusions section, organize exclusions between those that apply to the numerators, denominators, or both and between those that are data exceptions versus PID policy exclusions. - Add new table to each PID reflecting status of state approval when appropriate. <p>* Examples provided are not all-inclusive.</p>	<p>6. Parties agreed to remove the footnote for MR-6 because it has no relevance to this PID.</p> <p>Qwest will provide an update on the status of the Minnesota Wholesale Service Quality appeal and inclusion of new OP-5.</p> <p>12/18 – Agreement was reached on using hyperlinks to go directly to the Definition section of the PIDs for Qwest-specific terms. Qwest also indicated that the new OP-5 will be included in the MN Wholesale Service Quality plan. It was also agreed that Qwest would file the administrative changes to the PIDs at the same time they file to update Ex. B of the SGAT in various states.</p> <p>1/8 – Qwest responded to various action items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Qwest will provide a test URL next week for the LTPA Website. 2. Qwest distributed its list of proposed Hyperlink terms. Parties agreed to add, "Lack of Facilities" to the list. 	
35b	Various PIDs	Qwest	Modify PIDs to correct inconsistencies.			
36	Various PIDs	Eschelon	Modify PIDs to include product disaggregations for batch hot cut.	Current PIDs do not have disaggregations for batch hot cuts.		

Worksheet Key	
Proposal Number	Sequential numbering of proposals – numbering to be assigned in final version of worksheet (2/28) once all proposals are in so that related proposals (e.g. same PM) will be grouped together numerically.
PID# or Subject	PID number the proposal applies to or a short title of the subject of the proposal.
Proposed By (Who)	Identification of the party making the proposal
Proposal (What)	A complete description of the proposal being made, including text for the business rules that reflect the letter and intent of the

Master Issues Matrix

As Of: 1/8/04

	proposal
Rationale for Proposal (Why)	Explanation, in detail, of why the proposing party feels this proposal has merit and should be accepted. Can refer to additional documentation the party provides which supports the proposal.
Alternative Proposal/Position	Alternate proposals, if any, along with a statement of position by the other party or parties stating positions.
Status of Proposal	Field to track the status of the proposal – Open, Deferred, Agreed to Original Proposal, Agreed to Alternate Proposal