FINAL 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 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 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 *(WORLDCOM COMMENT DIXON: how Qwest would move forward)* 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. (*WORLDCOM COMMENT BALVIN: Balvin stated that the CR has already been reviewed and evaluated by Qwest operations folks who determined Qwest inability to support the request so researching the issue would not be an at issue, it would simply be Qwest executives either backing the decision or not.*) 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 *(WORLDCOM COMMENT DIXON: once agreed to by the CLEC)*. 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 (*WORLDCOM COMMENT BALVIN: regarding the progress of the re-design sessions)* 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. (*ATT COMMENT-MENEZES With regard to the work Ms. Blackmun did on the webpage for notices, I believe I asked a question about how far back the notices on the website would go. I think the response was that she was looking into that. I think this should be reflected in the minutes and, more importantly, I would like to know the answer to the question. Thanks.*)

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.

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	

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

9/18	9/20	Company	Last Name	First Name	Email	Phone	Comments
x	X	XTel Solutions, Inc.	Lee	Judy	soytofu@pacbell.net	650-743-8597	