

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

TEL WEST COMMUNICATIONS, LLC  
  
Petitioner  
  
v.  
  
QWEST CORPORATION, INC.  
  
Respondent.

Docket No. UT-013097  
  
QWEST CORPORATION'S  
SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS  
REGARDING MOTION TO SUSPEND  
PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

Qwest hereby supplements its motion to suspend and its reply brief on said motion in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Fifth Supplemental Order Denying Motion to Suspend Proceedings and Narrow the Issues (the "Order") dated April 11, 2002.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Qwest filed a motion to suspend the Part B procedural schedule on March 22, 2002. The basis for that motion was that the parties' and the Commission's resources would be preserved and the possibility of inconsistent determinations could be minimized if the Part B procedural schedule were suspended pending issuance of the Commission's final order on the upcoming April-June hearings in the 271 dockets. Qwest will not further restate the details of its motion in these supplemental comments. Tel West answered the motion to suspend on March 27, 2002 and Qwest replied on April 3, 2002. On April 8, 2002, the Administrative Law Judge convened a telephonic conference during which he informed the parties that he was denying Qwest's motion and explained the reasons for his decision. A written order was issued and served on April 11, 2002. At paragraph 14, the Order invited Qwest to "proffer

1 additional arguments and evidence within 10 days of [the] Order to establish that the Commission intends  
2 to make a determination whether IMA GUI provides access to Qwest's OSS in substantially the same  
3 manner as SONAR or IMA EDI in the SGAT/271 Proceeding. Qwest's submission will be considered  
4 subject to WAC 480-09-810." During a conference call on April 12, 2002, the Administrative Law  
5 Judge denied Qwest's request to also provide supplemental comments and information regarding other  
6 issues stemming from the Order. Qwest had requested this clarification to ensure that it would not risk  
7 forfeiting its right to seek interlocutory administrative review of other determinations included in the Order  
8 if it did not, contemporaneously with filing this petition, file a petition for review with the Commission.<sup>1</sup>

9 Based on these supplemental comments and the records attached hereto, Qwest asks the Judge  
10 to enter an order reaching the following conclusion: contrary to paragraph 13 of the Order, the ROC  
11 OSS Test, and by extension the April-June hearings in the 271 dockets, involve a thorough evaluation  
12 and comparison of the IMA OSS interfaces and Qwest retail's electronic access to Qwest's OSS.

13 Once the Judge reaches this conclusion, Qwest requests that the Judge enter an order suspending  
14 the procedural schedule pending issuance of a final order by the Commission relating to the April-June  
15 hearings in the 271 dockets. To facilitate resolution, Qwest is willing to withdraw its request that the  
16 Commission narrow the issues in any respect at this time. Qwest, however, reserves the right to seek a  
17 narrowing of the issues once Part B is placed back on track following the Commission's resolution of the  
18 OSS and commercial performance issues in the 271 dockets.

## 19 **II. DISCUSSION**

### 20 **A. The ROC OSS Test has Thoroughly and Comparatively Reviewed Qwest's** 21 **Wholesale and Retail Electronic Access to Qwest's OSS (Tel West's "Manner"** 22 **Issue).**

23 The Judge's denial of Qwest's motion to suspend on the "manner" issue appears to center on the  
24 following finding at paragraph 13 of the Order: "Based on the record in this case, consultation with the

---

25 <sup>1</sup> Specifically, Qwest asked permission to provide the Administrative Law Judge additional information  
26 demonstrating that the ROC OSS Test, and thus the Commission's impending review of the ROC OSS Test results,  
27 included in depth consideration of Qwest's wholesale customer service operations. The Administrative Law Judge  
denied Qwest's request, but did state that he would toll the period for seeking administrative review of this and all  
other issues arising out of the Order until the Judge has ruled on these supplemental comments.

1 Commission's advisors in the SGAT/271 Proceeding,<sup>2</sup> and Commission Orders it is not clear that the  
2 Commission intends to make a determination whether IMA GUI provides access to Qwest's OSS in  
3 substantially the same manner as SONAR or IMA EDI. Unless the issue will be definitively addressed in  
4 the Commission's SGAT/271 Proceeding, there is no basis for narrowing this issue in this case."

5 With all due respect, the Order is incorrect that the ROC OSS Test does not include a  
6 comparative evaluation of the wholesale and retail electronic interfaces to Qwest's OSS. It absolutely  
7 and exhaustively has. Tests 12, 15 and 16 relate directly to this issue.

8 **1. Test 12 – The POP Functional Evaluation.**

9 Test 12<sup>3</sup> of the ROC OSS Test is also known as the POP<sup>4</sup> Functional Evaluation. A copy of  
10 Section 12 of KPMG Consulting's Qwest OSS Evaluation Project Master Test Plan (Revised Release  
11 Version 5.1) ("Master Test Plan") is attached hereto as Exhibit A. In response to the query raised in  
12 paragraphs 13 and 14 of the Order, Qwest draws the Commission's attention to the following provisions  
13 of Section 12 of the MTP:

14 • Section 12.1: "The POP Functional Evaluation is a comprehensive review of the  
15 functional elements of Pre-Ordering, Ordering, Provisioning, Pre-Order/Order Data Integration; the

16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 <sup>2</sup> Qwest regrettably must state its concern that the conclusions reached in the Order were, in part, based on  
18 evidence or opinions not raised by either party and to which Qwest has had no opportunity to respond. The Order  
19 does not identify specifically what opinions or facts were expressed by the Commission's advisors. Thus, Qwest  
20 remains particularly disadvantaged from the perspective of trying to respond or clarify its position. As should be clear  
21 by the documents attached to these supplemental comments (documents, by the way, that Qwest referenced generally  
22 in footnote 5 of its motion to suspend and that Tel West made no attempt to rebut), the statement that the IMA vs.  
23 SONAR issues are not considered in the ROC OSS Test is inaccurate. Qwest would have preferred to have had the  
24 opportunity to provide the attached information in response to a bench request or in its reply brief. Having seen this  
25 statement for the first time in the Order, Qwest was without the ability or cause to do so.

26 Qwest faces the identical dilemma with regard to the customer service "quality" issue. The Order itself raises for  
27 the first time in this proceeding (since Tel West did not raise the issue) observations that the customer service issues  
are not part of the ROC OSS Test and that Qwest's wholesale customer service structure is a remnant of a merger-  
related agreement between Qwest and a particular CLEC. Qwest feels it is even further disadvantaged given the ALJ's  
refusal to allow Qwest to submit supplemental comments to rebut (which it could easily do) those observations raised  
for the first time in the Order. As an aside, Qwest's undersigned counsel are unaware of to what merger-related  
agreement the ALJ is referring in the Order.

<sup>3</sup> The number of the test refers to the correlating section of the Master Test Plan establishing and defining the test.  
Revised Version 5.2 of the Master Test Plan can be viewed in its entirety at <http://www.nrri.ohio-state.edu/oss/oss.htm>.  
Qwest provided that website reference in its motion to suspend. Because of space limitations, Qwest did not detail  
each relevant and applicable provision of the Master Test Plan in its motion. Because Tel West raised no disagreement  
in its answer to the motion that these issues were within the scope of the ROC OSS Test, Qwest's reply did not detail  
or attach its sections.

<sup>4</sup> "POP" refers to Pre-ordering, Ordering and Provisioning processes.

1 achievement of the prescribed measures; and an analysis of performance in comparison to Qwest’s Retail  
2 systems.”

3 • Section 12.1: “The test will consist of live transactions submitted over the Qwest  
4 supported interfaces, both interactively via a graphical user interface (IMA GUI) and computer-to-  
5 computer interfaces.”

6 • Section 12.1: “Data on the POP processes will be collected, analyzed and used to  
7 produce the output reports. The POP functional and performance evaluation will examine an end-to-end  
8 view of the pre-ordering through provisioning process. It will include a mix of stand-alone pre-ordering  
9 and ordering transactions, along with pre-order transactions followed by orders, supplements, and  
10 cancels.”

11 • Section 12.4: “The order types identified above will be ordered using the available and  
12 applicable Qwest service delivery methods. The following service delivery methods will be  
13 tested:..Resale...UNE Platform, residential and business....”

14 • Section 12.4: “The orders will be placed using Qwest’s existing interfaces: GUI and  
15 computer-to-computer, and manual. The following assumptions pertain to ordering interfaces: . . . Qwest  
16 electronic interfaces, both GUI and computer-to-computer, will be tested during the Volume  
17 Performance Test [Test 15].”

18 • Section 12.6.2: “[Test 12] Activities . . . Assess quality of business processes and  
19 compare, where information is available, with equivalent retail processes.”

20 • Section 12.6.3: “[Test 12] Outputs . . . Qwest-produced, HP data to Qwest retail,  
21 adjusted [footnote omitted] retail or benchmark data comparison. . . . Measure of parity performance  
22 between retail and wholesale.”

## 23 2. Test 15 – The POP Volume Performance Test.

24 Test 15 of the ROC OSS Test also relates directly to Tel West’s “manner” issue. Test 15 is also  
25 known as the POP Volume Performance Test. A copy of Section 15 of the Master Test Plan is attached  
26 hereto as Exhibit B. The purpose of Test 15 is “to measure Qwest’s capability and identify potential  
27 choke points of the GUI and computer-to-computer interfaces and systems made available to HP [the

1 pseudo-CLEC assisting KPMG and the ROC in conducting the OSS Test]to access pre-ordering  
2 information and submit orders to Qwest at projected future volumes.” *Exhibit B, at 15.2.*

3 **3. Test 16 – CEMR Functional and Performance Evaluation.**

4 Likewise, Test 16 of the ROC OSS Test relates directly to Tel West’s “manner” issue. Test 16  
5 is also known as the CEMR [Customer Electronic Maintenance and Repair] Functional and Performance  
6 Evaluation. A copy of Section 16 of the Master Test Plan is attached hereto as Exhibit C. Test 16 “is a  
7 comprehensive review of the trouble administration functional elements of the IMA GUI, conformance to  
8 documented specifications and an analysis of its functionality in comparison to Qwest’s Retail front end  
9 systems for trouble management.” Test 16 has three major phases: (1) a basic functional evaluation; (2)  
10 a comparative functional evaluation;<sup>5</sup> and (3) a performance evaluation. *Exhibit C, at 16.1.* The stated  
11 objective of Test 16 specifically includes an evaluation “based on both quantitative and qualitative  
12 approaches, the equivalence of CEMR functionality to Qwest’s Retail front end systems for trouble  
13 management.” *Id., at 16.2.* One of the expected outputs of Test 16 is a summary report (which will be  
14 incorporated into KPMG’s Final Report) “comparing relative functionality in CEMR and Retail front end  
15 systems for Trouble Management highlighting differences and contrasting ease of use of the two systems  
16 in performing the functions observed.” *Id., at 16.6.6.*

17 **B. The Commission will have the Opportunity to Reach Conclusions on KPMG’s**  
18 **Findings with regard to Tests 12, 15 and 16 as Part of the April-June Hearings.**

19 KPMG is currently scheduled to issue its Draft Final report on April 19, 2002. The “Final Final”  
20 Report is scheduled to be issued in late May. Those reports will include an aggregation of KPMG’s  
21 discrete test reports for each test identified and defined in the Master Test Plan.<sup>6</sup> This includes Tests 12,  
22 15 and 16.

---

23 <sup>5</sup> The Master Test Plan further describes Phase 2 of Test 16 as follows. “Phase 2 involves observation of similar  
24 retail transactions and interviews of Retail Maintenance Administrators (MA) processing trouble calls and entering  
trouble reports into Qwest’s Retail front end systems to assess functionality in comparison to IMA GUI.” *Exhibit C,*  
*at 16.6.* The specific test activities for Phase 2 of Test 16 are further delineated at Section 16.6.3.

25 <sup>6</sup> See the “Interim and Final Report Approach” document produced and distributed by KPMG. The current version  
26 of that document is attached hereto as Exhibit D. See Exhibit D, page 2 (under the heading “KPMG Consulting final  
report”). This document can also be found electronically at [http://www.nrri.ohio-](http://www.nrri.ohio-state.edu/oss/master/execution/oct/interim&finalreport-rev100801.pdf)  
27 [state.edu/oss/master/execution/oct/interim&finalreport-rev100801.pdf](http://www.nrri.ohio-state.edu/oss/master/execution/oct/interim&finalreport-rev100801.pdf), a URL linked to the URL identified in footnote 5  
of Qwest’s motion to suspend.

1 KPMG's reports will be filed with the Washington Commission in the 271 dockets and the  
2 Commission will conduct hearings concerning the sufficiency and accuracy of KPMG's Test, as well as  
3 Qwest's performance results thereunder. CLECs, Commission Staff and Public Counsel have had the  
4 opportunity to raise objections to KPMG's findings and/or the sufficiency of Qwest's OSS throughout  
5 the ROC Test process. The Commission will be the ultimate arbiter in Washington of whether the results  
6 of the ROC OSS Test satisfy Qwest's non-discrimination obligations under the Act.<sup>7</sup>

7 Tel West's criticisms of IMA GUI are general in the sense that Tel West has not argued that its  
8 IMA GUI access is somehow different from other CLECs' IMA GUI access. Thus, the OSS's Test's  
9 evaluation of IMA-GUI is directly on point. The procedural schedule in Part B of this docket should thus  
10 be suspended until the Commission issues a final order including its conclusions regarding the functional  
11 and comparative sufficiency of access Qwest provides to its OSS. To do so would conserve the parties'  
12 and the Commission's resources, permit resolution based on a thorough and meaningful record and avoid  
13 the possibility of inconsistent results.

14 **III. CONCLUSION**

15 For the reasons stated above, Qwest requests the Judge to consider these supplemental  
16 comments and to grant Qwest's motion to suspend the Part B procedural schedule.

17 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of April, 2002.

18 QWEST

19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 Lisa Anderl, WSBA #13236  
22 Adam Sherr, WSBA #25291  
23 Qwest

24 <sup>7</sup> Despite deferring to the collaborative ROC OSS Test process to administer and perform the test of Qwest's OSS,  
25 the 13 state Commissions that comprise the ROC reserved ultimate jurisdiction to independently evaluate Qwest's OSS.  
26 This is evident in the ROC's Test Requirements Document ("TRD"), Section 4 of which is attached hereto as Exhibit E.  
27 The TRD can be viewed in its entirety at <http://www.nrri.ohio-state.edu/oss/master/master.htm>. The ROC stated at  
Section 4.1.4 of the TRD that "ROC member state commissions participating in the test retain all existing authority to  
carry out their statutory responsibilities within their respective states both during this collaborative test and after its  
completion. Each state commission may choose to include the test results and evaluation in its individual section 271  
proceeding as part of the total record and retains the prerogative to make determinations independently from the ROC  
process." *Exhibit E, at 4.1.4.*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1600 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 3206  
Seattle, WA 98191  
Phone: (206) 398-2500  
*Attorneys for Qwest*