

**DESCRIPTION OF CONSENSUS CONCEPTS ON THE PRIORITY ISSUES
IDENTIFIED AND DISCUSSED IN CMP REDESIGN IN THE CMP REDESIGN
MEETINGS HELD ON MARCH 5 – 7, MARCH 18 – 19 AND APRIL 2 – 4, 2002**

I. PRIORITY ISSUES DESIGNATED AS “1s” (possible they might result in impasse issues)

A12. Qwest to propose language on the criteria used to determine method of implementing regulatory changes

Consensus on concept:

- Unanimous agreement must be reached at the monthly CMP Systems meeting by Qwest and CLECs that a change request constitutes a Regulatory change.
- The general rule is that Qwest will implement a mechanized solution for a Regulatory change. If Qwest or a CLEC wish to implement a manual solution, either may propose such an implementation, the determination of which is subject to the information and voting described below.
- At this same meeting, Qwest will propose a mechanized or manual implementation plan required for compliance and provide cost analyses. The cost analyses shall include a description of the work to be performed and any underlying estimates Qwest has already performed for both manual and mechanized solutions.
- If one of the following exceptions applies, subject to a vote by Qwest and CLECs, a Regulatory change request will be implemented by a manual solution:
Exception A: The mechanized solution is not technically feasible, or
Exception B: There is significant difference in the costs for the manual and mechanized solutions. The cost estimates will allow for direct comparisons between mechanized and manual solutions, using comparable methodologies and time periods.
- The parties in attendance at the CMP meeting will determine by majority vote whether Exception A or B apply.
- Any party that disagrees with the majority decision associated with Exceptions A and B may initiate the dispute resolution process under the CMP. The majority decision will apply unless the outcome of a dispute alters the majority decision.
- CLECs and Qwest may otherwise agree to implement the Regulatory Change with a manual solution by unanimous vote.

A9-Part 1. Provide a decision on whether to provide copies of documentation regarding prioritization and sizing. This issue includes completion of the prioritization process within CMP.

Qwest's Position: No internal documentation (e.g., methods and procedures) will be shared with CLECs regarding procedures such as prioritization and sizing. CLECs raised objection to this position.

Consensus on concept. The Redesign team agreed in principle to the prioritization process for OSS Interfaces. CLECs and Qwest will prioritize all types of systems change requests (Qwest-initiated, CLEC-initiated, Regulatory and Industry Guideline). Prioritization of Industry Guideline and Regulatory change requests is limited to situations where such changes can be implemented in more than one release and still meet the mandated or recommended implementation date. Regulatory and Industry Guideline changes will not be prioritized if they must be implemented in the next major release in order to meet the mandated or recommended implementation date.¹

A9-Part 2. Discuss the Special Change Request Process (SCR).

Consensus on concept. Qwest and CLECs agreed in principle to the SCR. If a change request is ranked low, a party may choose to fully fund the implementation of that change by using the SCR. When practicable, an SCR change will be included in the next release for the affected OSS Interface. There are open issues relating to timing and cost.

A11. What is the status of a change when the escalation or dispute resolution is invoked? Embedded within this issue is the imbalance in treatment that CLEC CRs receive versus Qwest CRs.

Consensus on concept:

- If a CLEC invokes the dispute resolution process on a Qwest-initiated Product/Process change and requests that implementation be delayed as part of the dispute resolution process, Qwest will delay implementation for at least 30 calendar days.
- A private arbitrator may be used to determine whether Qwest must delay implementation of the change pending the determination of the CLEC's request for delay as part of the dispute resolution process.
- Losing party pays the costs of the arbitrator.

¹ This is based on the understanding that a change may be treated as a Regulatory change only if CLECs and Qwest unanimously agree to such treatment.

Open issue. CLECs asked whether an arbitrator provided by a state Commission would be considered to resolve a disputed issue (including the discrete issue of whether to delay implementation of the Qwest change). Qwest agreed to consider the issue and investigate further applicable state rules and procedures.

A2. State the criteria for Deny (reasons why) for the CR process.

Consensus on concept. The Redesign team agreed in principle that Qwest may deny a CR for one or more of the following reasons:

- **Technologically not feasible**—a technical solution is not available
- **Regulatory ruling/Legal implications**—regulatory or legal reasons prohibit the change as requested, implementing the request may negatively impact a performance measurement (PID) incorporated into a performance assurance plan, or if the request benefits some CLECs and negatively impact others (parity among CLECs). *(Note: CLECs do not agree that the highlighted text belongs here. This was to be readdressed after the impasse issue on PID/PAP changes was resolved. Since Qwest agreed that the resolution reached in Colorado will apply across the region (e.g., PID/PAP changes will not be treated as regulatory changes, the highlighted language should come out), this language should be removed.)*
- **Outside the Scope of the Change Management Process**—the request is not within the scope of the Change Management Process (as defined in the Master Red-line Framework), requests for information.
- **Economically not feasible**—low demand, cost prohibitive to implement the request, or both.

Qwest agreed that it must apply the above criteria objectively and that it must apply the same criteria in evaluating whether to deny (or even initiate) a Qwest-initiated change request. Qwest agreed that a change request will not be denied solely on the basis that the change request involves a change to Qwest’s back-end systems.

Further clarification from Qwest is required for the following proposed reason for denial of a change request:

- **Qwest policy** (consensus reached to rename this category)—the procedure is working, the requested change is not beneficial.

CLECs want the reference to “Qwest policy” deleted. There was agreement that a legitimate category may exist, but the CLECs wanted it defined in a more objective manner, renamed and discussed with CLECs.

The SCRCP may be used if Qwest or a CLEC chooses to fully fund the implementation of the request.

A1. Review the CR process to insure that the description of the output of each step of the process is clearly defined.

Consensus on concept. Qwest agreed to change the element from “Change Request Initiation Process” to “Change Request Process” and describe the end-to-end milestones. This process is critical to documenting an understanding of CMP. More discussion is necessary to develop details to this process.

Vc. What changes are CLEC-impacting and what process governs them? What is the process when a CLEC-impacting change occurs, but was not expected?

Preliminary consensus on concept. Qwest and CLECs re-scoped this issue to focus on the relationship between the IT Wholesale Systems Help Desk (IT Help Desk) and the Interconnect Service Center Help Desk (ISC Help Desk) when a system or process problem significantly impacts one or more CLECs. The Redesign Team agreed that when there is a problem that significantly impacts a CLEC(s), Qwest will troubleshoot the root cause of the problem, and if possible provide a workaround until the problem is fixed and problems with orders in the pipeline are resolved. Qwest and CLECs agreed to the following concept:

- **Potential systems problem**—When there is a major problem potentially caused by a systems problem and a CLEC reports the trouble (and magnitude of the problem) to the IT Help Desk, a trouble ticket will be created to begin the process of troubleshooting the systems problem. If the Wholesale IT Help Desk determines from the CLEC that this problem is preventing the CLEC from performing certain transactions, the ISC Help Desk will be bridged into the call. The ISC Help Desk will open a ticket, if applicable. The ISC Help Desk will relate the IT Help Desk ticket number to the ISC Help Desk ticket number. The ISC Help Desk agent will immediately escalate this problem to the ISC Help Desk manager to determine the appropriate next steps such as creating a workaround if possible (if not already created by the IT Help Desk), so that the CLEC can perform transactions once again and fall-outs or rejects can be successfully reprocessed. The CLEC will be asked to provide as much documentation (e.g., LSR, telephone numbers, circuit numbers) as possible to the ISC Help Desk by facsimile or electronic mail so that the root cause can be identified as quickly as possible. The workaround shall remain in place even after the system problem has been fixed, so that pipeline activities can be resolved. The ISC manager, or assigned representative, will coordinate the transition from workaround to the business-as-usual process with the CLEC. Qwest shall comply with the Production Support notification process and the

ISC Help Desk personnel will receive and review all such notifications.

- **Potential process problem**—If the CLEC calls a significant problem into the ISC Help Desk, a ticket will be opened to track the trouble. The ISC Help Desk agent will immediately escalate this problem to the ISC Help Desk manager to determine the appropriate next steps such as creating a workaround if possible, so that the CLEC can perform transactions once again and fall-outs or rejects can be successfully reprocessed. Once such a trouble is reported a project will be created within the ISC Help Desk and all related troubles will be reported for resolution as part of the project. The CLEC will be asked to provide as much documentation (e.g., LSR, telephone numbers, circuit numbers) as possible to the ISC by facsimile or electronic mail so that the root cause can be identified as quickly as possible. The workaround may require both Qwest and CLEC to perform temporary functions and the workaround shall remain in place until the process has been fixed and pipeline activities are resolved. The ISC Help Desk manager, or assigned representative, shall coordinate the transition from workaround to the business-as-usual process with the CLEC. Qwest will continue to communicate with the CLEC(s) during the workaround period.

The Redesign Team acknowledged that there is preliminary consensus on this concept, with the exception of Eschelon, which intended to review this process with its subject matter experts.

A7. Where will a CR that impacts both an OSS interface and process be addressed—at the Systems or Product/Process CMP meeting? Embedded in this issue is Part B of ATT’s February CMP Comments: product/process must be addressed at least to the extent that there is a process to handle crossover issues.

Consensus on concept. CLECs and Qwest agreed conceptually to three crossover CR scenarios:

1) **Product/Process CR becomes a System CR**—If during a clarification call, it is determined that a product/process change should be mechanized, a new system CR will be created. The two CRs will be cross-referenced. The CR number will remain the same except with the change in the first two letters and an “x” somewhere in the CR number to indicate the CR is a crossover. The change will be handled as a system CR moving forward.

2) **Systems CR becomes to a Product/Process CR**—If it is determined that a system CR cannot be mechanized, but a manual process is feasible, the request will be handled as a Product/Process CR. The System CR will be closed and the Product/Process CR number would remain the same except the change in the first two letters and an “x” somewhere in the CR number to indicate the CR is a crossover. This change will be managed as a Product/Process CR moving forward.

3) **System CR with a manual interim solution**—These changes will be tracked as a Systems CR with an indicator of a combination solution. This CR will be managed at the monthly CMP Systems meeting.

Crossover CRs will remain in the same CR lifecycle as before the crossover whenever possible (in other words, there should be little or no loss in time just because the CR moved from one process to the other). An ad hoc clarification meeting may be necessary to address details of the crossover request with the appropriate subject matter experts. Once Qwest and CLECs agree to the crossover, the CR will be moved over to the appropriate CR process and general CMP forum. The initial status of the crossover CR will be “transferred.” The upcoming general CMP meeting distribution package will list CRs that have been crossed over for discussion.

III. Part H: The significant CMP Product/Process issues need to be resolved in order for Qwest to rely on its SGAT as support for its section 271 application. References to Qwest PCATs and Technical Publications in the SGAT cannot change the existing SGATs and interconnection agreements. However, to the extent that Qwest wishes to change the terms of the SGAT by its PCATs or Technical Publications, there must be an effective, balanced industry process that controls the changes to those product documents. CMP Product/Process is currently a “notice and go” process. Qwest tells CLECs that Qwest is changing something and then Qwest implements the change. There is only discussion after the fact. This process must be more collaborative. CLECs should have input into changes before they are implemented.

Consensus on concept. CLECs and Qwest agreed to five levels for Qwest-initiated product/process changes as follows:

Level 0: Changes that do not change the meaning of documentation and do not alter CLEC operating procedures. Level 0 changes are effective immediately without notice.

Level 1: Changes that do not alter CLEC operating procedures or changes that are time critical corrections to Qwest products or processes. Time-critical corrections may alter CLEC operating procedures, but only if such changes have first been implemented through the appropriate Level under CMP for such changes. Level 1 changes are effective immediately upon notice.

Level 2: Changes that have minimal effect on CLEC operating procedures. Qwest will provide notice of Level 2 changes at least 21 calendar days prior to implementation.

Level 3: Changes that have moderate effect on CLEC operating procedures and require more lead-time before implementation than Level 2 changes. Qwest will provide initial notice of Level 3 changes at least 31 calendar days prior to implementation.

Level 4: Changes that have a major effect on existing CLEC operating procedures or that require the development of new procedures. Level 4 changes will be initiated using the CMP CR process and provide CLECs with an opportunity to have input into the development of the change prior to implementation.

Each Level of change in this process will have a list of changes that fit within the level. CLEC and Qwest agreed that the list of changes for each Level is exhaustive, not illustrative. This means that if a change is not listed within a Level, Qwest may not issue the notice within that Level (even if Qwest believes it should fit within that level). In exchange for Qwest's agreement to the concept of an exhaustive list, CLECs agreed (although Eschelon reserved its right to disagree after review) that a Qwest change that did not fit into any currently defined change within a Level would be introduced as a Level 3 Qwest-initiated product-process change and discussed at the next CMP Product/Process meeting.

CLECs and Qwest have agreed to a process that provides for the parties to discuss requests to change the disposition level of noticed changes, or to establish new change categories under Levels 0 through 4, at the monthly CMP Product/ Process meeting. In the event that Qwest and CLECs are not able to reach consensus on any such request, Qwest and CLECs will take a vote to determine if the requested category should be changed to another level. The result will be determined by the majority. If the level of a specified change request is modified, from the date of the modification forward, such change will proceed under the modified level. When a change to the level of a specific CR also suggests that a new category of change be established under one of the levels, a separate vote shall be taken for each. The majority vote rules.

CLECs and Qwest agreed in concept. The Redesign Team agreed to continue to discuss the process for Qwest-initiated Product/Process changes with the CLEC community at the March 20, 2002 CMP Product/ Process meeting. The Levels 0 through 4 process will be implemented by Qwest as soon as practicable. Qwest and CLECs will further evaluate and modify this process as necessary. Further actions will be taken by the Redesign Team as follows:

- CLECs and Qwest will review product/process notices issued over the last few months in order to create a more exhaustive list of categories in each "level." This effort should be completed by April 16, 2002.
- Once this is completed and the language for the process is finalized, CLECs and Qwest will baseline this process, add the language into the Master Redline Framework and implement the process as modified.

**A6. What is the process to manage changes to performance reporting calculations, etc.?
How do we handle the overlaps between what is being negotiated at the CMP Redesign
and CPAP-like procedures? (CMP Issues Log # 158.) This includes establishing a process
connection between PIDs and CMP as described in Part F of AT&T's February CMP
Comments.**

Consensus on concept. Qwest and CLECs agreed in concept that changes to PIDs, changes to how PIDs are measured, and changes to PAP that have an impact on matters that arise in CMP will be brought to the (yet to be established) long-term PID administration body to resolve. Furthermore, Qwest or a CLEC may initiate a change request (following the process for a Qwest or CLEC initiated change request) based on PID changes originated from the long-term PID administration body. These change requests will have no special status. The CLECs remain concerned that the long-term PID administration body has still not been established.

A3. Determine whether a process is necessary to address non-coding changes.

Consensus to consolidate this issue with V.c and III.Part H.

Vd. What is CMP's role in rate changes or rate "validation"?

Consensus to close issue. Qwest and CLECs agreed that rate changes and rate validation processes are not within the scope of CMP, but should be addressed as provided by interconnection agreements.

II. PRIORITY ISSUES DESIGNATED AS "0s" (not likely to result in impasse issues)

A10. Qwest to outline what the guidelines are for when an issue is appropriate for the CMP vs. when the Account team should handle it.

Consensus on concept. CLECs and Qwest agreed in concept that the CMP is not the forum to resolve isolated issues or CLEC specific problems that do not involve a change to the way Qwest does business. When issues of this kind arise, CLECs are to either go to their service managers at Qwest or to service specific contacts (e.g., billing, network repair). Qwest agreed to share this process, once it is written, with the service managers and other Qwest functional areas referenced in this process to ensure that CLECs do not have to educate Qwest employees on Qwest policy (an issue that does arise with some frequency).

A4. What are the criteria used to determine "level of effort" (i.e., S, M, L, XL) for a release?

Agreement reached on language. CLECs and Qwest agreed that level of effort refers to the estimated range of hours required to implement a change request. Qwest stated that it will no longer use the S, M, L or XL designation. The level of effort in hours will be provided for each system CR and Qwest will also provide the number of person hours that are available for any given release.

A5. Clarify what notices will be communicated to CLECs via email, mail-outs, communiqués, and posted on the web site.

Consensus on concept. Qwest and CLECs agreed in concept that Qwest would include an identifier on all CMP notifications to indicate that they have to do with CMP. Notifications have come from different sources within Qwest, although Qwest states that they are all to come through the Qwest “mailout” process. Qwest agreed to provide a default method for CLECs to send comments to Qwest when the comment button on the web does not work. Qwest agreed that when CLECs comment on a proposed change in process, Qwest will aggregate all such comments and Qwest responses in one e-mail message that Qwest will distribute to all CLECs.

Vb. Defined Terms used in the Redlined Draft CMP Document must be concluded.

Agreement reached on language. CLECs and Qwest have reached agreement on the definitions of terms thus far identified in the CMP Redesign process.

Ve. What process will be used to make changes to CMP once it has been “redesigned”?

Consensus on concept. A party seeking a change to the CMP will send an e-mail with its proposed redlined language changes to a CMP e-mail address at least fourteen (14) days prior to a CMP Product/Process meeting. A proposal to change CMP will be included in the distribution package for the meeting and will be highlighted on the agenda. The initiator will present the proposed change at that meeting. The CMP body will determine an appropriate process to discuss and develop the change (e.g., at regular CMP meetings, establish a subcommittee to develop the issue, etc.). Each proposed change will be assigned a unique tracking number. A proposed change to the CMP will be presented in at least two CMP meetings before a vote can be taken on the change.

Incorporating a change into the CMP document requires a unanimous vote. Voting on such changes requires development because there are a large number of CLECs registered for CMP, but who do not participate, so a unanimous vote of all CLECs registered with CMP will not be possible. There must be ample notice on such changes, especially the fact that a vote will be taken. CLECs and Qwest present at the call or meeting may vote and the

opportunity to vote by e-mail should be available as well. The parties also need to discuss the concept of a party giving its proxy to another party for voting on changes.

The CMP document will be dated, will be assigned version numbers and an historical log of changes will be maintained.

Vf. SGAT Section 12.2.6.

Agreement on language (but some language still open). At the end of the CMP Redesign meeting held on April 4, 2002, the parties to CMP Redesign agreed to the following language for SGAT Section 12.2.6, however, Qwest was to propose further language on the topic of how changes to CMP become a part of the SGAT. The Joint CLECs have not received this additional language yet.

12.2.6 Change Management

Qwest agrees to maintain a change management process, known as the Change Management Process (CMP), that is consistent with or exceeds industry guidelines, standards and practices to address Qwest's OSS, products and processes. The CMP shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (i) provide a forum for CLEC and Qwest to discuss CLEC and Qwest change requests (CR), CMP notifications, systems release life cycles, and communications; (ii) provide a forum for CLECs and Qwest to discuss and prioritize CRs, where applicable pursuant to Exhibit G; (iii) develop a mechanism to track and monitor CRs and CMP notifications; (iv) establish intervals where appropriate in the process; (v) processes by which CLEC impacts that result from changes to Qwest's OSS, products or processes can be promptly and effectively resolved; (vi) process that are effective in maintaining the shortest timeline practicable for the receipt, development and implementation of all CRs; (vii) sufficient dedicated Qwest processes to address and resolve in a timely manner CRs and other issues that come before the CMP body; (viii) processes for OSS Interface testing; (ix) information that is clearly organized and readily accessible to CLECs, including the availability of web-based tools; (x) documentation provided by Qwest that is effective in enabling CLECs to build an electronic gateway; and (xi) a process for changing CMP that calls for collaboration among CLECs and Qwest and requires agreement by the CMP participants. Pursuant to the scope and procedures set forth in Exhibit G, Qwest will submit to CLECs through the CMP, among other things, modifications to existing products and product and technical documentation available to CLECs, introduction of new products available to CLECs, discontinuance of products available to CLECs, modifications to pre-ordering, ordering/Provisioning, maintenance/repair or Billing processes, introduction of pre-ordering, ordering/Provisioning, Maintenance/Repair or Billing processes, discontinuance of pre-ordering, ordering/Provisioning, maintenance/repair or Billing process, modifications to existing OSS interfaces, introduction of new OSS interfaces, and retirement of existing OSS interfaces. Qwest will maintain as part of CMP an escalation process so

that CMP issues can be escalated to a Qwest representative authorized to make a final decision and a process for the timely resolution of disputes. The governing document for CMP, known as the Change Management Process, is attached as Exhibit G (the “CMP Document”). As of the date of filing, the CMP Document (Exhibit G) is the subject of ongoing negotiations between Qwest and CLECs in the ongoing CMP redesign process. Not all of the sections of Exhibit G have been discussed or considered during the ongoing CMP redesign process, and the CMP Document will be continued to be changed through those discussions. Exhibit G reflects the commitments Qwest has made regarding maintaining its CMP as of the date of filing, and Qwest commits to implement agreements made in the CMP redesign process as soon as practicable after they are made. Following the completion of the CMP Document, Exhibit G will be subject to change through the CMP process, as set forth in the CMP Document. Qwest will maintain the most current version of the CMP Document on its wholesale website.

12.2.6.1 In the course of establishing operational ready system interfaces between Qwest and CLEC to support local service delivery, CLEC and Qwest may need to define and implement system interface specifications that are supplemental to existing standards. CLEC and Qwest will submit such specifications to the appropriate standards committee and will work towards their acceptance as standards.

Covad #1. Clarification of Scope of Issue. This issue was to clarify that with regard to changes that are CLEC impacting and the process to deal with them, this issue affects systems, products and processes.

Closed. This issue was closed as being addressed by other issues on the list.

Covad #2. Define the Exception Process

Consensus on concept. The parties agreed that the exception process could be used any time a party to CMP seeks to deviate from the established process. (e.g., shortening a CR life cycle or interval). The requesting party will send an exception form to the CMP CR distribution list (this form needs to be developed) and must demonstrate an emergency or other good cause for this process to apply. If there is sufficient time, the issue will be discussed at a regular CMP meeting otherwise a special meeting may be called. Qwest will provide notice at least two business days in advance of an exception call or meeting. The CMP body will vote on whether a matter may be addressed through the exception process. A majority vote determines the outcome.

Open issue in redesign. Qwest is considering the CLEC request that Qwest operational SMEs be made available to participate in calls and meetings where the issue being considered under the exception process is being discussed. This is extremely important to CLECs, because without such participation, calls and meetings are unproductive. Generally, only Qwest process people

attend. They do not able to discuss issues in depth and are not able to problem solve with CLECs. This results in multiple meetings where very little gets accomplished, while a problem continues to exist.

Factual issue. CLECs and Qwest worked on a bulleted exception process in the fall of 2001. This process was not added to the Draft CMP Document. AT&T and Qwest each invoked the exception process at the CMP meeting held on March 20, 2002, on separate CRs they submitted to CMP. The Qwest CR has already been implemented. The AT&T CR has to do with the many problems AT&T is experiencing with the local service freeze Qwest has implemented. The way this issues is being handled, it is clear to AT&T that no effective exception process exists yet in Qwest's CMP. This is presently impacting AT&T's day-to-day business. (*See* the discussion on local service freeze in Section II of the body of the Brief to which this Exhibit is attached).

Covad #3. Clarification of Scope of Issue. This issue is to clarify that changes on the retail side of Qwest's business may be CLEC-impacting in that if such changes are not made available to CLECs, there is a lack of parity between the retail and wholesale sides of Qwest's business.

Open. No consensus on concepts yet. An example of this lack of parity was discussed at the CMP Redesign meeting held on April 2 – 4, 2002. CLECs were not satisfied with the outcome of that discussion because it was an example where Qwest's retail business was successfully provisioning ISDN loops where integrated pair gain is on the line for purposes of providing IDSL service. CLECs were not informed or notified of this change in any way by Qwest (and discovered that Qwest is currently capable of provisioning ISDN loops where IPG is on the line only by happenstance), nor did Qwest ever identify the time at which it began providing this service to its own end user customers. (This issue is described further in Section II of the Brief to which this Exhibit is attached).

The Joint CLECs believe this is an example of Qwest's CMP being ineffective because processes within Qwest are not adequate to insure that retail changes that impact CLECs will be communicated to the Qwest wholesale business and promptly made available to CLECs.

WCom. Discuss change management improvement document and process to deploy Qwest CMP improvements. By what method does Qwest propose to prove that it has actually implemented changes as it represents it has done/is doing/will do?

Open. There continues to be disagreement on the time at which Qwest has implemented changes agreed upon CMP Redesign. In addition, there is lack of clarity on the extent to which certain processes were implemented on given dates. CLECs and Qwest will continue to work on a document that reflects a common understanding of implementation of the redesigned CMP.

III. PRIORITY ISSUES DESIGNATED AS “X” DO NOT REQUIRE ANY DISCUSSION

These issues are either at impasse or conceptual agreement was already reached by Qwest and CLECs.

A8. Qwest proposed re-visit Regulatory type of changes to address performance measure obligations (PID/PAP changes).

The Colorado PUC has ruled on this impasse issue. Qwest and CLECs agreed to revisit the Master Redline Framework to determine if clarifying language is necessary. Qwest has agreed that this resolution will be applied in all of the Qwest states.

Va. Discussion and documentation of the process for Industry Guideline changes must be completed.

Consensus on concept. Qwest and CLECs agreed in principle with the process for Industry Guideline changes.