

EXHIBIT B

Qwest-CLEC Change Management Process

Concepts Agreed Upon through the April 2-4, 2002 Redesign Session In Response to ATT's, Covad's and WCom's Priority Lists

Qwest and CLECs through the last Change Management Process ("CMP") Redesign session held on April 2 through April 4, 2002 were successful in reaching consensus of all twelve (12) categorized "1" issues and eight (8) of ten (10) categorized "0" issues. The remaining two categorized "0" issues are Covad Issue #3 regarding retail changes that may be CLEC-impacting and WorldCom issue on the CMP improvement document. CLECs took away an action item to review documentation that Qwest provided on retail-wholesale parity in response to Covad issue #3 so that this issue can be discussed and closed at an upcoming Redesign session. The other "open" WorldCom issue was identified as a document that required ongoing updating as the team continued to discuss and agree on detailed provisions of various CMP elements.

The team discussed all categorized "1" and "0" issues and the team agreed that no impasse issues were identified. (Refer to Attachment 1: Ranking of ATT Priority List Items Identified as 1's and Attachment 2: ATT Priority List Identified as 0's.)

I. PARTIES AGREED CONCEPTUALLY ON CATEGORIZED "1" ISSUES IN ORDER OF RANKING

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

Consensus on concept (March 5 – 7, 2002). The Redesign team agreed in principle to the following:

- 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 vote upon 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.

LA9-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. However, the team agreed that this is not an impasse issue.

Consensus on concept (March 5-7, 2002). 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

Language baselined (April 2-4, 2002). The Redesign team modified Prioritization language to incorporate a process for late added change requests that are eligible for inclusion, as a candidate, in the most recently prioritized release. The team agreed to close this issue.

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

Consensus on concept (March 5-7, 2002). Qwest and CLECs agreed in principle to the SCRCP. If a change request is ranked low, a party may choose to fully fund the implementation of that change by using the SCRCP. When practicable, an SCRCP change will be included in the next release for the affected OSS Interface.

I.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 (March 5-7, 2002). The Redesign team agreed in principle to the following:

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.

- If a CLEC invokes the dispute resolution process on a Qwest-initiated Product/Process change and requests that implementation is delayed as part of the dispute resolution process, Qwest will delay implementation for at least 30 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.

Open issue. CLECs asked whether an arbitrator provided by a state Commission would be considered to resolve a disputed issue. Qwest agreed to consider the issue and investigate further applicable state rules and procedures.

Potential deal breaker. CLECs are concerned that the availability of a delay in implementation is limited to Product/Process changes that Qwest is required to initiate by submitting a change request. CLECs believe that more of Qwest's product/process changes should go through the CR process, because of potential impacts to the CLECs' business. Qwest proposed four (4) levels for a product/process change as follows:

- Level 1 changes are defined as changes that do not alter CLEC operating procedures or are time critical corrections. No change request will be initiated. Notice will be provided.
- Level 2 changes have minimal effect on CLEC operating procedures. No change request will be initiated. Notice will be provided with an opportunity for comment.
- Level 3 changes have moderate effect on CLEC operating procedures and require more lead-time before implementation than Level 2 type of changes. No change request will be initiated. Notice will be provided with an opportunity for comment.
- Level 4 changes have a major effect on existing CLEC operating procedures or require the development of new procedures. A change request will be initiated.

March 18-19, 2002 Update. This proposal was further addressed at the March 18-19, 2002 session, as summarized below with Issue III. Part H.

April 2-4, 2002 Update. This proposal was modified to add a Level 0 along with a finite list of categories for each level, as summarized below with Issue III. Part H.

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

Consensus on concept (March 5-7, 2002). 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).
- **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 same above criteria objectively and that it must apply the same criteria in evaluating whether to deny 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 exists, but the CLECs wanted it defined in a more objective manner and renamed.

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

Denial of CR Reasons baselined (March 5-7, 2002). The Redesign team agreed to incorporate these reasons into the redlined framework and for Qwest to implement as soon as practicable. This issue is closed.

I.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 (March 5-7, 2002). Qwest agreed to change the element from “Change Request Initiation Process” to “Change Request Process” and describe the end-to-end milestones. 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?

Consensus on concept (March 18-19, 2002). Qwest and CLECs re-scoped this issue to focus on the relationship between the Wholesale IT Help Desk and the Interconnect Service Center (ISC) Help Desk when a system or process problem significantly impacts a single CLEC or other 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 pipeline activities are resolved. Qwest and CLECs agreed to the following concept:

- **Potential systems problem**—When there is a major problem potentially caused by defects in software (system problem) and a CLEC reports the trouble (and magnitude of the problem) to the Wholesale IT Help Desk, a trouble ticket will be created to begin the process of troubleshooting. If the Wholesale IT Help Desk agent determines from the CLEC that this problem is preventing the CLEC from performing certain transactions, a

ISC agent will be bridged into the call. The ISC will open a ticket, if applicable. The ISC Help Desk will relate the IT ticket number to this case. The ISC agent will immediately escalate this problem to the ISC 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. 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 shall remain in place even after the system defect 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.

- **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 agent will immediately escalate this problem to the ISC 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. 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 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.

April 2-4, 2002 Update: Qwest agreed to modify language with more detail for the process on managing process-production support problems.

I.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 (March 18-19, 2002). 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. 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 (March 18-19, 2002). CLECs and Qwest agreed that the list of changes for each level is exhaustive, not illustrative. 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 CR that did not fit into any currently defined type of change would be introduced as a Level 3 Qwest-initiated product-process change.

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 1 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 1 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.
- After this review, the Redesign Team will determine if Levels 1 through 4 remains, or if there are three levels, then the default is less than the change request level.
- Also after this review, CLECs and Qwest will baseline this process, add the language into the Master Redline Framework and implement the process as modified.

April 2-4, 2002 Update. The Redesign team agreed to five levels of change and the importance of developing a finite list of categories for each level. Level 0 changes are defined as changes that do not change the meaning of documentation and do not alter CLEC operating procedures. Level 0 changes are effective immediately without notice, web change form, or history log. Level 1 changes are defined as changes that do not alter CLEC operating procedures or changes that are time critical corrections to a Qwest product or process. Qwest will provide a notice and the changes are effective immediately. For Level 1 changes, there is no comment cycle, but a web notification form and history log will be provided. Level 2 changes are defined as changes that have minimal effect on CLEC operating procedures. For Level 2 changes, Qwest will provide a notice at least 21 calendar days in advance of implementation, and there will be a comment cycle and website link to documentation. Level 3 changes are defined as changes that have moderate effect on CLEC operating procedures and require more lead-time before implementation than Level 2 changes. For Level 3 changes, Qwest will provide a notice at least 31 calendar days in advance of implementation, and a comment cycle and website link to documentation will be provided. Level 4 changes are

defined as 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 change request process. For all levels 0-4, the Redesign team agreed that if a change is not identified as a category under any of the finite Level change categories, the change would default to a Level 3 process. Further discussion and baselining of the finite Level change categories will be held at the April 16, 2002 CMP Redesign session.

**I.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 (March 18-19, 2002). Qwest and CLECs agreed that changes to PIDs, changes to how PIDs are measured, and changes to PAP will be brought to the long-term 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.

I.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.

III. PRIORITY ISSUES VALUED AS "0"

Eight of ten priority issues valued as “0” reached consensus in principle and some closed with baselined language for the redlined framework. Further or ongoing discussions will be held on the remaining two issues.

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

April 2-4, 2002 Update. The Redesign team agreed on language and closed this issue.

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

April 2-4, 2002 Update. The Redesign team agreed on language with a remaining action item #272—identify CMP notices with “CMP” on subject line.

I.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.

April 2-4, 2002 Update. The Redesign team discussed and agreed in principle with Qwest’s proposed language. Qwest has agreed to modify language for an upcoming Redesign session with the inclusion of the role of an Account Manager. The team agreed that this language should be included in the “Getting Started” section on the website.

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

April 2-4, 2002 Update. The Redesign team baselined the terms identified so far in the redlined framework with the understanding that other terms may be included. The terms-definitions will be incorporated as a section to the redlined framework. The team agreed that this issue is closed.

**Ve. What process will be used to make changes to CMP once it has been “redesigned”?
By what method does Qwest propose to prove that it has actually implemented changes as
it represents it has done/is doing/will do?**

April 2-4, 2002 Update. The Redesign team reviewed Qwest’s proposed language on “Managing the Change Management Process.” The team developed language which was incorporated in the redline framework and agreed that there can be additional discussion at an upcoming redesign session. The team was able to reach agreement in principle. This issue is closed.

The team also agreed that the second part of this issue should be combined with the WorldCom issue below.

Vf. SGAT Section 12.2.6.

April 2-4, 2002 Update. The Redesign team discussed proposed modifications for the SGAT Section 12.2.6 on Change Management from ATT. The participating attorneys will further modify ATT’s proposed modifications, but the team reached agreement in concept.

Covad#1. Clarification of Scope of Issue.

April 2-4, 2002 Update. Covad closed this issue based on the agreements on the five levels for product/process changes. The team agreed to create a third Covad issue to address the second part of this issue pertaining to retail parity. Covad #1 is closed.

Covad#2. Define the Exception Process.

April 2-4, 2002 Update. The Redesign team agreed in concept on an Exception Process. An exception is considered to be any deviation from the Change Management Process such as a request to shorten the change request lifecycle or the need to implement an emergency software patch. There must be good cause for a change to be considered an exception. If a vote is required to accept the change as an exception, then majority rules. Qwest agreed to consider CLEC input and return with modified language at an upcoming Redesign session.

Covad#3. Retail Changes that May Impact CLECs.

April 2-4, 2002 Update. The team agreed to review Qwest's documentation in response to ATT's and Covad's issues on retail changes. This issue will be discussed for closure at an upcoming Redesign session.

WCom. Discuss change management improvement document and process to deploy Qwest CMP improvements. Also, Ve. ~~What process will be used to make changes to CMP once it has been "redesigned"?~~ By what method does Qwest propose to prove that it has actually implemented changes as it represents it has done/is doing/will do?

April 2-4, 2002 Update. CLECs reviewed the CMP Improvement document. Eschelon stated it shall annotate the document. The team agreed that this document will require updating on an ongoing basis.

IV. PRIORITY ISSUES VALUED AS "X" DO NOT REQUIRE ANY DISCUSSION

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

I.A8. Qwest proposed re-visit Regulatory type of changes to address performance measure obligations.

March 18-19, 2002 Update. 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.

April 2-4, 2002 Update. Qwest and CLECs agreed that the Colorado PUC's resolution will apply to all fourteen states.

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

Consensus on concept (March 5-7, 2002). Qwest and CLECs agreed in principle with the process for Industry Guideline changes.

V. CONCLUSION

This concludes the summary of discussions and the Redesign Team's success in reaching consensus in principle for all twelve (12) issues categorized by the team as 1's and eight of ten (10) issues categorized as 0's. The team will continue to develop language for these agreed upon concepts.

EXHIBIT B

ATTACHMENT 1

Ranking of ATT Priority List Items Identified as 1's – 04-04-02

Concept Agreed To?	Language Agreed To?	Issue #	Issue	Allegiance	AT&T	Covad	Eschelon	Qwest	World Com	Total
Yes	Language available; pending Redesign Team review	I.A.12.	Qwest to propose language on the criteria used to determine method of implementing regulatory changes. (CMP Issues Log # 243.)	8	2	1	4	1	2	18
Yes	Yes	I.A.9.	Provide a decision on whether to provide copies of documentation regarding prioritization and sizing. (CMP Issues Log # 196.) This issue includes completion of the prioritization process within CMP (CMP Gap Analysis ## 117 – 120 & 124.) [Late Adder]	9	3	3	2	2	8	27
Yes	Language available; pending Redesign Team review		Also, discuss the Special Change Request Process (SCRCP)							
Yes	Language available; pending Redesign Team review	I.A.11.	What is the status of a change when the escalation or dispute resolution is invoked? (CMP Issues Log # 226.) Embedded within this issue is the imbalance in treatment that CLEC CRs receive versus Qwest CRs. (CMP Gap Analysis # 20.) [Postponement language]	1	8	8	1	5	7	30
Yes	Yes	I.A.2.	State the criteria for Deny (reasons why) for the CR process. (CMP Issues Log #118; CMP Gap	11	1	2	5	4	9	32

Concept Agreed To?	Language Agreed To?	Issue #	Issue	Allegiance	AT&T	Covad	Eschelon	Qwest	World Com	Total
			Analysis # 59.)							
Yes	Pending Qwest modification	I.A.1	Review the CR process to insure that the description of the output of each step of the process is clearly defined; i.e., LOE (range of hours) and affinity. (CMP Issues Log #214; CMP Gap Analysis ## 121 – 123.)	6	6	5	9	3	6	35
Yes	Pending modification	V.c.	What changes are CLEC-impacting and what process governs them? What is the process when a CLEC-impacting change occurs, but was not expected? (CMP Issues Log ## 110 & 179.) 3/18: Team agreed that this item pertains to the IT Help Desk and ISC help desk relationship.	2	10	7	6	7	4	36
Yes	Language available; pending Redesign Team review	I.A.7.	Where will a CR that impacts both an OSS interface and process be addressed – at the Systems or Product/Process CMP Meeting? We will need to develop language to address this issue. (CMP Issues Log # 163.) Embedded in this issue is Part B of AT&T's February CMP Comments: product/process must be addressed at least to the extent that there is a process to handle crossover issues. [Crossover CR]	10	4	4	7	10	3	38

Concept Agreed To?	Language Agreed To?	Issue #	Issue	Allegiance	AT&T	Covad	Eschelon	Qwest	World Com	Total
Yes	Pending Qwest modification	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. See also CMP Gap Analysis ## 20 – 22 & 114. 1 [Qwest-initiated Product/Process Change Process]	5	9	9	11	6	1	41
Yes	Pending	I.A.6.	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	4	5	11	8	9	5	42

Concept Agreed To?	Language Agreed To?	Issue #	Issue	Allegiance	AT&T	Covad	Eschelon	Qwest	World Com	Total
			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.							
Yes	Yes	I.A.3.	Determine whether a process is necessary to address non-coding changes. (CMP Issues Log #137.)	7	7	6	10	8	10	48
Yes	Yes	V.d.	What is CMP's role in rate changes or rate "validation"? (CMP Gap Analysis ## 1 & 2.)	3	11	10	3	11	11	49

ATT Priority List Items Identified as 0's – 04-04-02

Concept Agreed to?	Language Agreed To?		Issue
Yes	Pending modification	I.A.10	Qwest to continue what the guidelines are for when an issue is appropriate for the CMP vs. when the Account team should handle it. (CMP Issues Log #216)
Yes	Yes	I.A.4.	What are the criteria used to determine "level of effort" (I.e., S, M, L, XL) for a release? (CMP Issues Log #146.)
Yes	Yes, pending action item #272	I.A.5.	Clarify what notices will be communicated to CLECs via email, mail-outs, communiqués, and posted on the web site. (CMP Issues Log # 156.) This also relates to CMP Gap Analysis # 101: "We continue to receive notices for scheduled system downtime on too short notice (i.e., on 1/10/02 at 5:30 p.m. received notice on DLIS being down 1/12/02 all day). We have discussed in Redesign having Qwest provide these notices further in advance. We would like to receive them at least 5 business days in advance."
Yes	Yes	V.b.	Defined Terms used in the Redlined Draft CMP Document must be concluded. (CMP Issues Log ##106, 133, 141, 162, 182 & 248.)
Yes	Yes	V.e.	What process will be used to make changes to CMP once it has been "re-designed"? By what method does Qwest propose to prove that it has actually implemented changes as it represents it has done/is doing/will do? (CMP Gap Analysis # 103. Also CMP Gap Analysis # 116.) 3/18/02: Combined with WorldCom issue. [Managing the CMP]
Yes	Pending modification	V.f.	SGAT Section 12.2.6. (CMP Gap Analysis ## 148 & 149.)
Yes	Yes	Covad Issue #1	<u>Clarification of Scope of Issue.</u> In its List, AT&T identified the issue of "[w]hat changes are CLEC impacting and what process governs them? What is the process when a CLEC-impacting change occurs, but was not expected?" AT&T List, p. 7, subpoint (c). Covad agrees that this is an issue requiring resolution before Section 271 relief may be given, but clarifies that it believes this issue must be addressed in terms of (1) product, process and systems changes that are CLEC-impacting, and (2) retail changes that may be CLEC-impacting. 4/03/02: Captured as

Concept Agreed to?	Language Agreed To?		Issue
			separate issue, Covad Issue#3.
Yes	Pending language	Covad Issue #2	<u>Additional Issue.</u> In addition to the issues identified by AT&T, Covad believes that an exception process must be agreed upon and included in the parties' Master Redlined CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign Framework Interim Draft (<i>i.e.</i> , the "CMP contract"). Currently, while the parties have agreed in principle on the method and use of an exception process in connection with the CMP, that agreement is not reflected in the master redlined document. Accordingly, while this remains an issue to be resolved, Covad believes it is non-controversial and can be quickly and easily accomplished by the parties.
OPEN	Pending CLECs review of Qwest provided Retail-Wholesale documents	Covad Issue #3	<u>Clarification of Scope of Issue.</u> In its List, AT&T identified the issue of "[w]hat changes are CLEC impacting and what process governs them? What is the process when a CLEC-impacting change occurs, but was not expected?" AT&T List, p. 7, subpoint (c). Covad agrees that this is an issue requiring resolution before Section 271 relief may be given, but clarifies that it believes this issue must be addressed in terms of (1) product, process and systems changes that are CLEC-impacting, and Closed See Covad Issue #1 (2) retail changes that may be CLEC-impacting.
OPEN	Ongoing Redesign Team review	WorldCom	Change Management improvement Document and Process to deploy Qwest CMP improvements. (Action Item #231) 3/18/02: Combined with ATT issue V.e--By what method does Qwest propose to prove that it has actually implemented changes as it represents it has done/is doing/ will do? (CMP Gap Analysis #103, 116)