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 email 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.

<u>System Category</u>
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.

<u>Network Category</u>
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.

<u>Serial Number and Suffix</u>
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.

- #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.

- #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 email 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.

<u>Item 3—KPMG Consulting</u>: Osborne-Miller-AT&T wanted clarification on KPMG's role in the re-design effort. Rc 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.

<u>Item 4—Exception Process</u>:
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 2page 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.

<u>Item 5—Unilaterally Demand CLEC Adoption of Release Notification</u>: 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 3d 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 font 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.

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

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	

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

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

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

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.?

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

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)					
	Held, Escalated, and Expedited Tool (HEET)	Training, Descriptor 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.

The naming convention above does not apply to CRs. CRs will continue to show CR # and
Note 2:   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.

<table>
<tr><td>

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

</td><td>

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

</td></tr>
</table>

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	**Status History**
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.	12/01/00 Submitted 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) and 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.

AT&T

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.

2

- Large number of customer calls or access blocked, sent to overloaded offices: calls not distributed or cut off.

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.

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.

Outage and Severity-Level Definitions, continued

Severity 4: Minimal Impact	Descriptors

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.

<div align="center">

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
Revised—August 16, 2001

</div>

<div align="right">

Attachment 11

</div>

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)

<div align="center">

1

</div>

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