

EXHIBIT C

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

**CLEC – Qwest Change Management Process Redesign
Monday, March 18 and Tuesday, March 19, 2002 Working Session**
1005 17th Street, Junior Boardroom and Boardroom, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 877.550.8686, passcode 2213337#

NOTE: These are DRAFT meeting minutes Qwest developed following the two day working session.

INTRODUCTION

The Core Team (Team) and other participants met March 18 and 19 to continue with the Redesign effort of the Change Management Process. Following is the write up of the discussions, action items, and decisions in the working session. The attachments to these meeting minutes are as follow:

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: CMP Redesign March 18-19 Attendance Record
- Attachment 2a: CMP Redesign Meeting March 18-19 Notice and Agenda – 03-12-02
- Attachment 2b: CMP Redesign Meeting March 19 Notice and Revised Agenda – 03-18-02
- Attachment 3: CMP Issues Priority 3.5.02 TMC final_ATT List_prioritized- 03-06-02
- Attachment 4: CMP Redesign Core Team Issues Action Items Log - Revised-3-19-02
- Attachment 5: Qwest_Proposed_Qwest-Initiated_ProductProcessChgsLanguage-Revised 03-19-02
- Attachment 6: Schedule_of_CMP_Re-design_Working_Sessions – Revised 03-19-02
- Attachment 7: Ranking of ATT Priority List Items Identified as 0's – 03-18-02

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting began with introductions of the meeting attendees. (Refer to Attachment 1 for attendance record) Judy Lee, the meeting facilitator, reviewed the two-day agenda (Attachment 2). Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that the Colorado Commission ruled on the PID/PAP impasse issue. The Commission ruled that PID/PAP changes are not considered Regulatory type of changes. Quintana-CO PUC continued that PID/PAP changes would require Qwest or a CLEC to initiate a change request, and that they would not be considered as Regulatory. Quintana stated the Colorado Commission wanted this process to begin with IMA 12.0.

AT&T Priority List Issues

Lee stated that Doberneck-Covad and WorldCom filed comments to ATT's Priority List with the Arizona Commission. The team will need to categorize these additional issues as with ATT's list of issues. This will be done later on the agenda. (Refer to Attachment 3)

V.c Attachment 3

Menezes-AT&T asked what the process is if a CLEC finds a problem with a change after it was implemented—would this trouble go through the Production Support process, and used as examples the local service freeze issue or a recent change to a back end system that affected LSRs. Schultz-Qwest responded that since the change was not OSS Interface related, the problem would not go through the Production Support process. Menezes-AT&T also stated that there are situations when CLECs are required to call in multiple trouble tickets based on affected volume for one issue. Thompson-Qwest clarified that when a CLEC calls an OSS Interface trouble into the IT Help Desk, only one ticket is required. Menezes-AT&T explained that there

EXHIBIT C

was a situation when ATT had to report ten groups of five orders for the LSR affected by the systems problem—that there were 50 affected orders/LSRs. He requested that tickets should be grouped into one ticket, not entered as individual trouble tickets. He stated that currently the process limits 5 orders/LSRs per ticket. Thompson-Qwest clarified that in this situation, Qwest did require a CLEC to report the systems problem on one ticket but that there may be multiple tickets for the orders affected. He stated there are other situations when individual tickets are required for a problem. For instance, a circuit governed by a service agreement that indicates a refund will be rendered because of a trouble caused by Qwest, refunds can only be processed on a per ticket basis. Balvin-WorldCom asked for clarification if the discussion was on product/process or systems issues. Lee stated that Menezes-AT&T was asking for support when Qwest makes a back-end systems change (not OSS Interface) that impacts a process. She asked if Menezes-AT&T was asking for process support. Menezes-AT&T caucused with ATT representatives.

Clauson-Eschelon suggested a notice like Event Notifications for OSS Interfaces be distributed if many CLECs are affected by a process problem. Bahner-AT&T joined the meeting to further discuss the example Menezes-AT&T provided regarding 50 LSRs. She continued to say that there is no process to address multiple orders caused by one system problem. Schultz-Qwest stated that AT&T was requesting a process change and should submit a CR. Jacobs-Qwest stated that if Qwest was receiving multiple calls from CLECs stating that there was an issue with a process, Qwest could call an emergency meeting and handle the problem on an expedited and escalated basis. Schultz-Qwest stated that she wanted to bring in Qwest ISC help desk subject matter experts to continue this discussion. She continued that she was not suggesting that the entire process be a CR. Jacobs-Qwest stated that there is already a process established within CMP for escalations. See Action item #260 Help Desk Process

Balvin-WorldCom suggested that the concepts of AT&T priority list items III. Part H and Vc be combined.

A.7 Attachment 3

Lee moved the team to issue A.7 and referenced Issues/Action Items Log #163. She read from #163 a response from Qwest. Schultz-Qwest stated that if a problem needs a manual process, then the CR number would change from a system CR to a product/process CR. That CR would remain in the same stage of its life cycle. If a CLEC asked for a product/process change, and the team decided that a system change is more appropriate, the product/process CR will crossover to become a systems CR. The product/process CR is closed and a system CR will be opened. Balvin-WorldCom stated that under this example there would be a two-tier change—systems and process changes. Schultz-Qwest stated that an example is an IMA release where CLECs and Qwest would submit a CR for systems, and related process changes would fall under that CR. This CR will be processed under systems. Balvin-WorldCom asked if Qwest was stating that a manual change would not take place until the system change was in place. Schultz-Qwest stated that all system changes would remain as a system CR unless there is a manual process. Wicks-Allegiance stated that if a CLEC submits a system CR and the change will not take place until the next release, the CLEC would need to request the manual interim process up front. He stated that this could take place in the clarification call. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the CLECs want mechanization and do not want to remove systems CRs. Schultz-Qwest stated that systems changes would be managed by systems CMP. She continued that the only way a system CR would change to a product/process CR was if the system CR was denied. The system CR, in this case, would be closed because there was no mechanized solution, and a product/process CR could be created. However, there would be a reference to both CRs in the narrative section. The CR would not be discussed at both meetings. Menezes-AT&T stated that communication is needed as to which CMP forum will address the CR so appropriate CLEC representation attends the correct meeting. Balvin-WorldCom asked if the CR would get the same level of attention if the CR becomes a product/process change. Schultz-Qwest stated that it would and described the process: 1) If during a clarification call, it is determined that a product/process change should be mechanized, a new system CR will be created with the two CRs will be cross-referenced. The change will be handled as a system CR moving forward; 2) If it is determined that a system CR

EXHIBIT C

cannot be mechanized but a manual process is possible, the change would move to product/process. The system CR would be closed and the CR number would remain the same except the change in the first two characters; and 3) A system CR with a manual work around. These changes would be tracked in systems with an indicator that this is a combination CR. Items will remain in the same lifecycle whenever possible. There may need to be additional clarification meeting because there will be other SMEs involved. Menezes-AT&T asked what would occur if a product/process CR came in and Qwest determined there should be a system solution. Schultz-Qwest stated that the process team would look at LOE and evaluate if it should be a system change. If it is apparent that this should be a system change, the process team will bring in the system SMEs. Menezes-AT&T stated that if Qwest had three weeks prior to the CMP meeting, the CLECs would expect that the recommendation would be brought into the CMP meeting. Schultz-Qwest stated that at the next meeting, following the acceptance that the changes would move from product/process to systems, the change would then follow the normal process. Dixon-WorldCom stated that there is currently a CR similar to what is being discussed. The CR is PC020602-1: CLEC trouble ticket cross-reference. The CR went through the process and was determined that it would be a system change, SCR030702-1. Menezes-AT&T asked if the process would start over with the clarification call. Jacobs-Qwest stated that if a CR were transferred there would need to be some level of clarification. Dixon-WorldCom stated that the CR was cross-referenced in the database and that it stated in the dialogue that additional clarification meeting was not needed. He continued that in this example it shows that the process is working. Clauson-Eschelon asked if it was a joint decision to reclassify the change. She asked what would happen if a CLEC did not agree with moving the change. Schultz-Qwest stated that if a system change was denied Qwest would look at manual solutions. Menezes-AT&T asked how the determination was made to do a manual solution. Schultz-Qwest stated that if a CR was denied (based on the reasons in the "Reasons for Denial" language) then the change might be implemented manually. She added that a cross reference could be added in the name of the CR. For example, add "X" to the end of the name (PC020602-1X). Menezes-AT&T asked if a few other items could be added to the process: 1) lifecycle remains the same, 2) unique identifier in CR number indicating a crossover CR, and 3) distribution package lists CRs that have been crossed over for discussion. With this change the CLECs in the CMP meeting would know that it has moved to systems or product/process. Clauson-Eschelon noted that not all the statuses in the database cover everything. Schultz-Qwest stated that there could be another status called "transfer." Lee asked if there was agreement on concept and the team agreed. A7—agreement in concept.

Upcoming Redesign Session

The team decided to discuss the upcoming meeting while waiting for material to discuss the next issue. Dixon-WorldCom proposed moving the April 16 Redesign meeting to April 19, because of the ROC Technical Conference in Santa Fe. After some discussion, the team agreed that the next meeting stands at April 16. The team also scheduled two-day sessions in May and June. The first day of each session is from Noon to 6 PM Mountain Time, without lunch. The second day meeting is from 9 AM to 5 PM Mountain Time, which includes an hour lunch. (Refer to Attachment 6 for the schedule)

III. Part H Attachment 3

Menezes-AT&T stated that this related to Qwest-initiated Product/Process CR language. (Refer to Attachment 5) He referred the team to changes to PCAT and Tech Pub and referenced the SGAT. He emphasized the need to decide on a Qwest-initiated Product/Process change process, because of the impact PCATs and Tech Pubs changes have on business processes. Clauson-Eschelon stated that CLECs needed more than just a notice for changes. Schultz-Qwest stated that there were Levels 1-2-3-4 and Qwest should not be required to submit CRs for insignificant changes. She stated that it is important to not bog down the CR process. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Eschelon wants a CR from Qwest on those changes even though Qwest deemed the change not to be moderate or significant. Menezes-AT&T suggested looking at the items in Level 3 and analyze what changes would need a CR or should move to Level 2. He

EXHIBIT C

suggested that Qwest provide examples. Schultz-Qwest stated that a matrix could be provided. She stated that Qwest wanted the flexibility on Levels 1 and 2. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the team would not be able to develop a complete list in one day, and suggested that Qwest bring all changes into the CMP meeting. During the CMP meeting the additional items could be added to the list. The changes could be submitted as CRs or just submitted and the CLECs would determine the level. Balvin-WorldCom stated that the CLECs wanted Level 3 and Level 4 to be CRs. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest would be able to look at Level 3's being CRs, but that telephone number changes shouldn't be CRs. Clauson-Eschelon asked why the team couldn't come up with a comprehensive list and then bring the issue into CMP. The process would be as follows: 1) Complete a CR, 2) Before Qwest completes the action for the CR, hold a special meeting, and 3) Hold a comment period. She stated that the CLECs want to see the change before it went into effect. Crain-Qwest stated that Qwest did not want to bog down the process by completing a CR for every change. He continued saying that the CLECs were looking at the issue as "it's CR or it's notice and go." He said that was not Qwest's position. Balvin-WorldCom stated that the CLECs wanted a CR for Level 3 and 4 and that Level 1 and 2 could be under the current process. Liz continued saying that the process currently in place is not working. Schultz-Qwest suggested after lunch the team review a preliminary matrix developed by Qwest.

Action Item #151: Closed. The team discussed and modified the CMP Redesign Core Team expectations and responsibilities document. The revised document will be posted on the CMP Redesign web site as reference.

Covad and WorldCom Comments to ATT's Priority List

Doberneck-Covad introduced two additional issues and Balvin-WorldCom presented one issue. These issues were categorized as 0 —needs further discussion, but most likely not impasse issues. These three issues were added to the ATT Priority List—identified as 0's (see Attachment 7). Balvin-WorldCom questioned the Change Management Improvement document and process to deploy CMP Improvement. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Qwest committed to update the document. Balvin-WorldCom wanted each piece part listed with implementation dates. Lee referenced Action item #231 for Qwest to share updated matrix.

A.6 Attachment 3

Lee moved the team to issue A.6 regarding PID/PAP and CPAP. Menezes-AT&T asked if this issue should be brought to CMP or not. He stated his understanding that Qwest does not want PID/PAP or reporting of PID brought into CMP. Balvin-WorldCom stated that there could be a system change that would cause the data (for a PID) to be gathered differently. Crain-Qwest stated that Balvin was referring to a change in IMA that may change something in another area. Dixon-WorldCom stated that during the ROC meeting Qwest stated that CMP was not the governance forum for PID/PAP. He asked what body that would be. Crain-Qwest suggested a forum similar to the ROC/TAG. Menezes-AT&T asked if PIDs that were not under PAPs would be worked in this forum. Menezes-AT&T asked if the ROC/TAG would apply to multiple states. Crain-Qwest stated that if the team used the ROC to decide on PIDs, they would still need to look at CPAP. Balvin-WorldCom stated that there could be a system change through the CR process that affected the calculation of PIDs. She stated that if there was such a change this would need to go through the same forum. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that the process has been changed as a result of the report from the Special Master. Dixon-WorldCom stated that the issue is "what is the forum" for long-term PID administration. He stated that he thought that the CMP forum, like Redesign, met the requirements. Menezes-AT&T stated that CRs for PID measures were rejected. Crain-Qwest stated that if a PID needed to be changed then the change needed to go to another forum. Menezes-AT&T stated that there needed to be a forum when ROC/TAG no longer existed. The forum needed to be a place where CLECs and Qwest could discuss PIDs and resolve related issues. Crain-Qwest stated that could all take place through the current process. Menezes-AT&T stated again that there needed to be a forum when ROC/TAG was gone. Crain-Qwest suggested that Menezes-AT&T craft language. Action item #262.

EXHIBIT C

Quintana-Colorado PUC asked if Crain was talking about PIDs that are under PAPs. Crain-Qwest stated that the ROC/TAG-like forum would deal with both. Menezes-AT&T suggested talking about what the forum would look like and asked if the PID administration is state-by-state. Crain-Qwest stated that there should be a 14-state governance. He continued that state commissions could still make a decision to overrule. He then stated that the concept was if an issue results from CMP that is related to a PID, then any party may bring that issue to the body that administers PIDs. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that a CR could be denied if there was a decision in the managing forum. Crain-Qwest stated that hopefully the team could reach agreement without dispute resolution. Balvin-WorldCom stated that if the change impacted a PID then it would need to go to the forum. Crain-Qwest stated that Qwest or a CLEC needed approval to change a PID. He continued that if a PID caused a change to a system then the change needed to come to CMP. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that a CLEC would have to be involved in CMP and the ROC/TAG-like forum. The team agreed in concept and created a new action item #262 for Menezes-ATT to craft language.

A.3 Attachment 3

The team then moved to A3, which related to Action Item #137. Thompson-Qwest stated that this issue was on Terms definition. Schultz-Qwest stated that an example would be a GUI change, and that other changes were already covered in the Master Redline document. Menezes-AT&T stated that the issue was if there was a change to a back-end system that did not cause coding changes, but did change the process. He asked how these changes would be handled. He agreed that the issue was already dealt with for systems. Clauson-Eschelon stated that if it was not in the scope of CMP and not CLEC affecting, that it would not be a CR. Thompson-Qwest stated that, on the CLEC side, it is coding vs. non-coding changes. Menezes-AT&T asked if CLECs are notified of all Qwest coding changes. Thompson-Qwest stated that CLECs are not notified of all back-end changes. If there is a change in the OSS Interface then there is notification. If the back-end system change requires a process change then the team needed to discuss how that change occurs. Menezes-AT&T stated that Qwest was assuming that there is not an impact to the CLEC. He asked what would be the judgment of Qwest to notify of a change or not. He continued that Qwest has documentation to refer to about changes affecting CLECs— if there is change to a process or a system that is CLEC affecting. Van Meter-AT&T stated that Qwest believes they are giving us all the notification CLECs need and there are other things that CLECs are not being notified on that are CLEC affecting such as with the Appointment Scheduler. Thompson-Qwest stated that the team was not trying to define coding versus non-coding changes. Coding versus non-coding is not a qualifier to determine if it should be managed through CMP. Lee asked if the term “non-coding” is used in the Master Redline, besides the definition for a point release under Terms. Dixon-WorldCom-Qwest stated that in the meeting minutes of October 30, 2001, Thompson provided an example of a non-coding change— changing the color of a GUI screen. Menezes-AT&T referred to the email he sent last Thursday in regards to CLEC notifications of system fixes that did not require coding changes, but did impact CLECs. Thompson-Qwest stated that in that example the CLEC should have opened a trouble ticket—there was no coding change required of the CLECs. If a trouble ticket was opened, an Event Notification may have been sent out. Menezes-AT&T stated that with most changes there would be document changes with a CR and with a release. Dixon-WorldCom confirmed after a scan of the Master Redlined document, there was no reference to the term “non-coding” except under the definition of a point-release. Lee asked if A3 could be closed. Menezes-AT&T stated it could be closed.

III. Part H Attachment 3

Schultz-Qwest stated that rate changes were not in CMP. She continued that there was a CR opened about rate validation. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Eschelon opened the CR and that rate and rate validation should be covered in the ICAs. Doberneck-Covad stated that there could be errors in rates and that rates are covered in the ICA. She stated the concern is rate validation, which should not go through CMP, but that there was a billing announcement that was sent out on November 1. This was a rate change and it was not under an ICA. This impacted Covad. Schultz-Qwest stated that this would also been covered in your ICA and also in the notification.

EXHIBIT C

Clauson-Eschelon stated that they are not receiving notifications according to their ICA, and sometimes the mail-outs are very confusing. She suggested that rate changes not be noticed through mail-outs. Schultz-Qwest asked if the team was stating that rate changes are not in CMP, and that these should be covered in the individual ICAs. Menezes-AT&T stated that an example was a Minnesota cost docket where AT&T asked for this to be reflected in the ICA. Crain-Qwest stated that the rate validation effort was to verify the rates that Qwest is charging are in fact correct. Doberneck-Covad stated that Covad received the notification of the true-up and disagreed. The notification stated "effective immediately." She stated that the CLECs needed a window of opportunity to deal with the issues before the effective date. Lee asked if the team wanted custom letters to go with the ICAs. Littler-Integra stated that there was a CR in response to discussion regarding changing rates and correcting rates. The CLECs requested to see the changes before they went into effect. The CLECs wanted to be on record for saying that Qwest cannot change the tables in ICA without communicating what is being changed. Crain-Qwest stated that the CLECs were again saying that they did not want rates in CMP. Doberneck-Covad agreed. Menezes-AT&T stated that it would be acceptable if there was a notification that stated that the Account Managers would be contacting CLECs in regards to rate validation. Schultz-Qwest stated that rate changes and rate validations are not part of CMP. She also clarified that there are type of notices that use the same mail-out tool such as tariff changes, promotions, etc. She added that the CR and escalation on rate validation should be withdrawn. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the CR should not be withdrawn, but could be issued as a revision or a new CR. She added that she did not want the notices. Doberneck-Covad asked how the CLECs could differentiate as to what notices are governed by CMP and which ones are not. Schultz-Qwest stated that the following headings were related to CMP: Product, Process, Systems, Training, CMP, and Network (Tech Pubs only). Clauson-Eschelon stated again that Eschelon did not want rate change notices by mail-out and only wanted notices in accordance to its ICA. Thompson-Qwest stated that notices are sent out for all system changes and not all CLECs are using all systems. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the rate change validation went into effect and the CLECs had not agreed to it. Crain-Qwest stated that the rate change validation was not a change in the ICA. Lee asked Clauson how to close this item. Clauson-Eschelon stated again that she did not want the mail-outs. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest abides with the ICAs. Menezes-AT&T stated that language should be added to the Scope section to reflect that rate changes and rate validation is not within the scope of CMP. Any changes or validations must be addressed between Qwest and individual CLEC. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the language needed to address that rates would not be changed by notice only. Dixon-WorldCom stated that Qwest already agreed to this. He then suggested that Clauson-Eschelon draft the language. Crain-Qwest stated that if Qwest determined that something in the system was wrong, then Qwest would fix the problem. Action item #264.

Menezes-AT&T stated that there needed to be a notice on the rate change and contract changes would be done one-on-one. Dixon-WorldCom stated that CLEC contracts and the SGAT states that there are less formal ways to deal with changes. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the CLECs receive notices about items that have already been done. Doberneck-Covad suggested, 1) put rates out of scope and address it on an ICA basis, or 2) put it into scope and hash it out. She stated that Covad wanted rates out of scope. Menezes-ATT agreed and then stated that if a notice came out and if the CLECs wanted detail they could ask Qwest. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she did not want rates in CMP, but if the CLECs cannot get details on the change what is the remedy? Crain-Qwest responded that just like anything else a CLEC goes through the agreement. Littler-Integra stated that change should be made through individual ICAs. Action item #263. Covad, Integra, WorldCom, and AT&T decided that rate changes are out of scope for CMP.

Action item #156: add the extract of "Types of Notices" from the Wholesale Communication Initiatives into the Master Redline.

Lee-Facilitator reviewed the proposed agenda for the next day and the meeting was adjourned.

EXHIBIT C

Tuesday, March 19, 2002

Lee welcomed the group and reviewed the revised agenda (Attachment 1).

V.c Attachment 3

The team started with issue V.c. This issue was re-focused to only address help desk relationships when a systems problem impacts a process. Schultz-Qwest stated that Terry Simmons and Michelle Thacker, both of Qwest, will speak on the ISC help desk issue. Simmons-Qwest walked through the process of the ISC. Bahner-AT&T described the issue when a change in a back-end system caused LSR problems. She stated that she wanted another process besides the “warm transfer” when there are problems with a high volume of orders. She wanted to be able to take the ticket number and know what the work around is. Simmons-Qwest stated that she still needed to know all the issues of a particular situation to be able to gather the resources needed to fix the problem. Bahner-AT&T stated that Qwest did not notify of the back-end change and there was an issue. She stated that when that happened they needed the connection between the centers and the service manager. The CLECs do not want to tell the story over and over again to different Qwest personnel. Simmons-Qwest suggested that a systems help desk ticket is related to a call center ticket to show the relationship. Bahner-AT&T stated that she wanted two tickets, 1) to fix the system problem for the orders, and 2) to get those impacted orders reprocessed or fixed. Thacker-Qwest stated that the process used the System War Room and IT SWAT team was to troubleshoot this type of problem. Bahner-AT&T stated that not everyone in Qwest know what the event notices are, and that this was especially a problem with system releases. She stated that all issues needed to be under one umbrella. Simmons-Qwest stated that 1) if an issue is outside of the normal process the CLEC would call their Service Manager. The Service Manager would report the trouble/s to the center.

Menezes-AT&T asked Bahner-AT&T if there is an issue that the CLECs would call the Wholesale Systems Help Desk. Bahner-AT&T gave the example of the LNP issue with the back-end systems change. The Saturday orders were sent on Monday and there were 60 orders affected by this change. In this case, CLECs were not notified. She suggested the following: 1) identify a problem and open an IT WSHD ticket, and 2) CLEC would be handed off to ISC and only one ticket would be created for all orders—resolving the issue with the volume of affected orders. The five orders per ticket process is fine for normal issues, but not when there are a lot of orders impacted by a single incidence. Lee recapped that a CLEC would call the IT help desk when a ticket is opened. The CLEC would ask Qwest to handle this issue as a project and then the expectation is that the IT help desk would coordinate with the ISC. The situation is two-fold: 1) There is a technical problem that IT needs to fix, and 2) there are orders that need to be corrected. Menezes-AT&T suggested adding another field in the database as a cross-reference between the two tickets. Thompson-Qwest stated that was not possible, but suggested that there could be a hand-off between the IT help desk and the ISC. Both help desks would have the ticket numbers and the CLEC could include all orders under that business ticket number. The CLECs would have a warm transfer between the help desks. Lee asked how Qwest would show in the system if multiple CLECs had the same issue. Thacker-Qwest stated that there would be a trend analysis done on the ISC database information, but that there would be a ticket opened for each CLEC relating to the same problem. Thompson-Qwest stated that there would be a common IT ticket and the ISC ticket will be opened for each reported and impacted CLEC. CLECs could call in any orders that fell under this situation. Bahner-AT&T stated that CLECs needed to be able to fax in all order issues under one ticket, not multiple tickets. Balvin-WorldCom asked what the trigger point would be for an issue to become a “project.” Thompson-Qwest stated that if a CLEC calls into the IT help desk and during the warm transfer the IT help desk would explain to the ISC center that there were related system issues, then at that time it could be considered a project. Balvin-WorldCom stated that the CLEC might not know that there was a system issue, but they would definitely know that there were problems with multiple orders. Thacker-Qwest stated that the CLEC would call the center, but the center would not know if there was a system issue. The center personnel would be instructed to bring this problem to the center coach. Lee recapped that for a significant situation as discussed, if a call was brought into the IT help desk, the CLEC will be given the IT ticket number. The IT help desk agent will then establish a 3-way call to the ISC.

EXHIBIT C

The CLEC would be given an ISC ticket number, if applicable, for all orders impacted by this problem. The CLEC faxes detailed documents to the ISC, if required. A work around is created and an IT event notice is issued. If a call originates in the ISC, a trouble ticket would be opened for all orders and would be escalated to the center coach. The CLEC would fax in all the orders and if possible, a manual work around will be created. Constant communication with impacted CLEC/s will occur. Notice will be issued if Qwest is having a process problem that impacts multiple CLECs.

Thompson-Qwest stated that in IMA 8.1 there were rejects and the edits were backed out. A notice was sent describing the problem encountered due to a back-end change and edits. Lee asked how the CLECs would be notified if it was a process change that was causing the problem. Simmons-Qwest stated that the coach would evaluate the problem and would work with the CLEC. Schultz-Qwest stated that if there was agreement that language will be drafted. Menezes-AT&T asked if SWAT teams also apply to other system changes. Thompson-Qwest stated that SWAT teams are established when problems are escalated to determine responses. In many cases, SWAT teams include ISC members. Lee asked if everyone conceptually agreed with the proposal. Every CLEC representative agreed in concept, however, Eschelon wanted to review this process with its SMEs.

Clarification Call Issue

Doberneck-Covad brought up an issue that during clarification calls, Qwest SMEs have stated "this issue needs to be run through CMP." She stated that SMEs did not understand that the clarification call was part of CMP. Doberneck-Covad asked how information was disseminated throughout the organization. Schultz-Qwest stated that training was given to Qwest personnel and that the CMP team is responsible for training the SMEs on an ongoing basis. Schultz stated that she would have her team reinforce the process with the SMEs.

III. Part H Attachment 3 and Qwest-initiated Product/Process Change Process

The team returned to issue III. Part H by reviewing and discussing Qwest's initial effort on the notification matrix. Schultz-Qwest pointed out that the matrix is a sample of notices for the month of February and that Qwest used its "best guess" effort for Level 1 and Level 2. She stated that there were 40 CRs for February. Balvin-WorldCom stated that the issue was with Level 3. Clauson-Eschelon expressed concern that notices would override contracts. She asked that Qwest bring all changes into the CMP and that the team would decide what Level the change fell into. Schultz-Qwest stated that the contract will not be overridden by changes in notices. Clauson-Eschelon stated that CLECs have to educate everyone at Qwest about their contract and that there is a problem with Qwest trying to apply PCATs to Eschelon. Dixon-WorldCom-stated mail-outs are not intended to supersede an ICA, SGAT, etc. Wicks-Allegiance stated that Clauson-Eschelon's issue is with the account team. Qwest personnel in other departments would not know individual ICAs. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she wanted input into the product/process changes. She suggested that the CLECs work with Qwest on building a finite list. She said there also needed to be a process for moving changes to a lower level and allowing for input. Schultz-Qwest asked why Clauson-Eschelon stated that the process had not worked in the past. She also asked how the process of bringing in the notices to CMP before distributing would solve the problem. Clauson-Eschelon stated that there were issues in the past and that she would be open to special meetings. Doberneck-Covad stated that for the most part CLECs don't have problems with changes. She continued that she didn't disagree with the levels, but wanted an exhaustive list. She suggested starting with Level 3 and work down to Level 1. If a change was not specific, it will require a CR, which can be added to the exhaustive list. This would result in Qwest not having to process all changes as CRs. Dixon-WorldCom suggested the following: 1) put comment about "notices not superseding ICAs" on the notice, 2) address support functions (account teams/service teams, etc.) in Qwest to understand contracts and mail-outs, 3) that the level should be identified in the notice, and 4) Level 3 notice period is acceptable because there is enough time to bring it to CMP. Schultz-Qwest suggested pulling a sample of Level 3's and CRs. She continued that Qwest could put the information on the mail-outs about

EXHIBIT C

ICA, Qwest will continue to work with the Service Managers, and Qwest can add the level onto the notice. Quintana-Colorado PUC asked if Qwest would work with the exhaustive list. Doberneck-Covad stated that the CLECs needed time to look at the impact of the changes. Schultz-Qwest stated that the issue was with time critical changes. Balvin-WorldCom stated that CLECs wanted input into the process, and that Qwest could take the last few months of changes and analyze the notifications to see which level would be assigned. Maher-Qwest stated that the CLECs should also look at the notifications. Balvin-WorldCom agreed. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the notices should actually have a SME listed for comments on the notice, and not a Service Manager. The SME would know the extent of the change. She then suggested that if there is a Level 3 change, Qwest should send the notices near the time of the CMP Monthly distribution package, so that the CLECs can review the list before the meeting. Dixon-WorldCom stated that there could be a sub-committee to review three months of notices with Qwest. The team would get together and look through all the notices. Crain-Qwest stated that the CLECs wanted to get Product/Process into place, and Clauson-Eschelon was asking for an absolute list. He agreed with the sub-committee recommendation raised by Dixon. Balvin-WorldCom stated that the CLECs wanted this implemented as soon as possible. She suggested that the SMEs look at the notification going forward and put the level on it. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she wanted Qwest to answer her other questions. Schultz-Qwest stated that SMEs didn't have the knowledge of individual accounts and their ICAs as an Account Manager/Service Manager, and that the other issue is that they would be pulled away from their current jobs to respond to account specific questions, which is the role of the Service/Account Manager. Wicks-Allegiance stated that the sub-team could look at the notices for January, February and March and also build an additional list of changes to work with. Thompson-Qwest asked if Qwest should use the categories that are in the proposed document. Clauson-Eschelon asked about the grouping of the notices. Dixon-WorldCom stated that there seemed to be a link between the changes that go out on certain days of the week. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest cannot issue service-specific contact information, because the contact information changes. Clauson-Eschelon stated that the volume of notices was too high and that they were received randomly. Quintana-Colorado PUC asked if the CLECs really wanted all comment periods due on the same day. Clauson-Eschelon stated she wanted the cycles due close to the CMP meeting. Schultz-Qwest stated that it is not practicable to hold all work until the end of the month to align with the CMP Monthly meeting, but that Qwest could designate the notice levels, and that each CLEC should go through and rank the notifications. If 100 are Level 1, they don't need to be discussed. The sub-committee call should focus on specific notifications in order to have some consensus and develop the finite lists for each level. Wicks-Allegiance stated that he did not want all notifications coming at one time and that he liked the idea of "tracking by level" that Schultz-Qwest suggested. Clauson-Eschelon agreed. Doberneck-Covad stated that the team needed to keep in mind that CLECs are adding to the list of Level 1-2-3-4 as they are looking at the notices. Littler-Integra asked that the matrix also include a description of the change. Action item #266.

Break for lunch.

Lee recapped what would occur with the sub team work: 1) Qwest will set up a call for next Thursday, March 28 for the morning, 2) Qwest will distribute a matrix with the addition of notice date and description of change by noon Monday 25th, and 3) Qwest will provide direction on how to get to the CNLA database. The call will focus on the differences among participants in determining the level for each notice. CLEC responses are due by noon on Wednesday, March 27 so that Qwest can compile the differences and similarities. Qwest will provide full list back to CLECs by COB Wednesday in preparation for the Thursday call. Maher-Qwest stated that 50-60% of the notices are going out with a 30-day notification period, and that Qwest has tried to implement based on where the process is moving to. Balvin-WorldCom stated that there needed to be some sort of notice, but "notice and go" is not giving the CLECs input into the process. CLECs cannot delay or get additional clarification prior to implementation. Schultz-Qwest suggested implementing an interim process that has Levels on Notifications. Clauson-Eschelon stated that Qwest could do them all as CRs and see the benefit. She stated that she did not want a comment cycle, but CRs for all Level 3 and Level 4's. Balvin-WorldCom suggested returning to Dixon-WorldCom's comment about moving Level 3 changes into CRs if a CLEC objected to the

EXHIBIT C

Level 3 change. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she did not agree with the levels and wanted to approve all changes. Schultz-Qwest stated that with the suggestions from Dixon-WorldCom and Doberneck-Covad, Qwest could bring the processes together. As the sub-team meets, the list of examples would be augmented. The methods and procedures would remain intact until the Redesign team reviews the outcome of the subcommittee recommendations. Balvin-WorldCom stated that in order to review the list, Qwest would need to bring about changes that are going to take place. Balvin-WorldCom stated that Qwest would bring the documented list and then all other changes would be a CR. Schultz-Qwest asked if there could be a commitment from the team to finish the process in the next three weeks. She stated that Qwest did not want to work with a narrow list. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she didn't want anyone to think that she had agreed to the language. She continued that Qwest could start using the levels and add to the list. Littler-Integra stated that he would like to go with the process that Balvin suggested. He wanted a process in place for the issues that impacted CLECs. He suggested drafting a finite list today and then another list in the future. He stated that the concept was sound, but that there needs to be rules around each one. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she would need a finite list. Schultz-Qwest stated that Dixon-WorldCom's proposal from this morning could work. Qwest would release changes under the finite list for Levels 1 and 2. For any change that was not on the list for Level 1 and Level 2, the change would be a Level 3 and the CLECs could comment or bring it in as a CR. Clauson-Eschelon stated that this would not work and that she didn't agree with Level 3. Wicks-Allegiance stated that the current process was not working for the CLECs. He asked if Qwest was proposing that Level 1 and Level 2 go as proposed in the language and then any other changes go to Level 3. Clauson-Eschelon asked if a finite list would be included. Balvin-WorldCom asked if Qwest was also saying that anything that was not on the list be issued as a Level 3. Schultz-Qwest stated that Qwest would track the notices by Level on the CMP website. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she did not agree to interim processes. Balvin-WorldCom stated that the interim process would be implemented in concept. Dixon-WorldCom suggested implementing the interim process with the understanding that it would be reevaluated. Maher-Qwest stated that there were a lot of changes already in the pipeline. Clauson-Eschelon asked if the changes could start as of next Thursday. Dixon-WorldCom asked if Qwest would implement the four levels and then the subcommittee will evaluate the process. Clauson-Eschelon agreed, but would not commit to the levels. Dixon-WorldCom stated that during the interim period, Level 3 could be asked to be moved to CRs. As the team was listing out the finite list of levels, the determination could be made to move the change to a CR. Schultz-Qwest stated that the change needed to be on the finite list, or it would default to a Level 3. Quintana-Colorado PUC suggested that if a change was not on the list then it would be Level 2 or Level 3. These would be new changes not listed on the finite list. The change would not default to a CR. Lee captured the following items on the board: "Implement Levels 1-4 immediately. If a change doesn't fit into the levels, Qwest will treat as a Level 3." Qwest to present at the CMP Product/Process meeting on Wednesday, March 20 that there is agreement on concept, but process is yet to be baselined. After the sub-committee call, the team may determine that there are 3 levels, and then Level 3 will default to Level 2's. Menezes-AT&T stated that the number of categories was not the issue. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she was asking for a reasonable amount of time for the CLECs to review the change. She asked if a CLEC wanted the change to be a CR, whether it would automatically be a CR. Menezes-AT&T stated that it would be a collaborative effort, not an individual CLEC request. Clauson-Eschelon stated that her core concern was about the number of notices and that she may miss a change. Menezes-AT&T asked Clauson-Eschelon if the Levels were designated in the notice and also on the website list, why that won't work. Clauson-Eschelon stated that she was okay with implementing the process. Menezes-AT&T stated that there should be language added in the proposed language and then work forward with what has been proposed by Schultz. The team agreed. Dixon-WorldCom stated that the team also needed to review the rest of ATT issue #3.

The team returned to ATT's issue list issue III, Part H. Lee stated that the action item was for Menezes-AT&T to pull SGAT language—action item #227. Lee stated that the group had discussed adding the SGAT language into the Master Redline. Menezes-AT&T stated that he would pull the language. Dixon-WorldCom stated that SGAT could not be amended and that

EXHIBIT C

neither a Tech Pub or PCAT could amend the SGAT. The concept that a PCAT/Tech Pub may need to be amended could be discussed in CMP. The SGAT is not amended in CMP. Menezes-AT&T stated that the team could close in concept to issue III. Part H.

Maher-Qwest asked what the team defined as “notice and go.” He stated that the CLECs viewed the process as notice=effective and that was not true because of the comment period. Menezes-AT&T stated that we do not need to define “notice and go” because it will not be a concept in the future. Lee suggested a 10-minute break and then the team will draft language in Qwest-initiated Product/Process Change Process. The team returned and Menezes-AT&T added language to the top of the document (See Attachment 5). Clauson-Eschelon asked if the interim list could have more than four levels. Schultz-Qwest stated that the process would be implemented as interim with modifications based on the sub-committee effort. She suggested adding the concept to the proposed language. Menezes-AT&T stated that it needed to be clear in the Level 1 and Level 2 language that if a change did not fit into the list it will be a level 3 change. Language was added to the proposed language. Doberneck-Covad asked how the list would be modified in the future. Menezes-AT&T discussed the process about disputing a notice that should be in another Level. Schultz-Qwest stated that a Level 1 type change was submitted as a Level 3, because it was not on the list, it could be brought to the CMP meeting and discussed. Menezes-AT&T suggested that language be added in the Level 3 “change in disposition” section. Once a new level is agreed to the category will be added to the appropriate list. Wicks-Allegiance stated that Qwest would have to prove why a change wasn't a CR, if other CLECs thought it was a CR. Schultz-Qwest stated that this was too time consuming and there would be multiple collaborative meetings. Clauson-Eschelon stated that just because a change is a CR, it should not have to include extensive collaborative meetings. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that the language was already in the process in a stand-alone document for postponement. She then stated that the CLECs were suggesting voting. Dixon-WorldCom suggested that only majority ruling moves the Level of the change. Menezes-AT&T stated a concern about what would happen if half of the CLECs wanted a CR, which resulted in a tie, then whether it would remain a Level 3. Wicks-Allegiance stated that the advantage was to not have any additional CRs. Menezes-AT&T stated that the idea was that Qwest would not have completed the process documentation in a CR, and CLECs would have more input into the change if it were a CR. Menezes-AT&T stated that if a change came in as a Level 3 and the CLECs thought it should be a Level 4, then the CLECs would not have the opportunity to provide all the input because the process would already be defined by Qwest. He continued that going forward that type of change would be added to the Level 4-CR list. Lee asked the team what the process is to break a tie. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that she thought that there would not be a tie, but if you leave it as a Level 3 it could be a Level 1 if agreed to by the team. Dixon-WorldCom requested that the tie issue be tabled for a later decision. The vote would be taken to determine if the change should be moved to a different level. If there is agreement on the Level, then the change would be listed in that Level going forward. Clauson-Eschelon stated that there is a difference in voting on a specific change and voting on a category. Quintana-Colorado PUC stated that the category is added to the level so that the change doesn't have to be brought to the CMP meeting in the future. Clauson-Eschelon stated that it shouldn't be automatic because you may never get another change that is exactly the same. Woodcock-Qwest stated that the thought was to develop a finite list. Menezes-AT&T stated that there would be a vote to have the level established, and then another vote to have the category added. Schultz-Qwest stated that it would be listed on the agenda as a standing item and any changes to levels to be discussed will be listed. Lee summarized that there would be a vote to determine level, and a vote to add category. Majority vote rules. Language was added to the proposed language. Lee stated that the next step was for Schultz-Qwest to present the proposed language at the CMP meeting the next day. Schultz-Qwest suggested CLECs review the language and provide feedback. Maher-Qwest stated that the information would be provided in the email the next day. Additionally Lee will send out the updated facilitator consensus document for comments, which are due by noon on March 25. Lee stated that all Rank 1 items on the list are closed.

EXHIBIT C

Next Meeting Topics

The team agreed at the next working session to discuss and baseline language for the 1's, then proceed to 0's. Meeting adjourned.

Attachment 2a

Announcement Date: March 14, 2002
Effective Date: March 18, 2002
Document Number: GENL.
Notification Category: General
Target Audience: CLECs, Resellers

Subject: Agendas for the March 18 and March 19, 2002 Qwest-CLEC Working Session to Modify the Change Management Process

The agendas for the upcoming Change Management Process Re-design working session with the Core Team are attached for your reference.

Do note this is a 2-day session with the following start/end time.

Date: Monday, March 18, 2002 and Tuesday, March 19, 2002

Location: **NOTE: NEW MEETING LOCATION**
Monday - 1005 17th Street, 1st Floor, Junior Board Room, Denver, CO
Tuesday - 1005 17th Street, 1st Floor, Board Room, Denver, CO

Time: 9 AM to 5 PM Mountain Time

Conference Bridge: Dial-In Number: 877.550.8686
Conference ID: 2213337#

The agendas will be posted on the web site along with meeting material:
<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/redesign.html>.

Sincerely,

Qwest

Attachment 2a

MEETING MATERIAL

1. CMP Redesign Meeting March 18 - 19 Notice and Agenda – 03-13-02
2. CMP Redesign Core Team Issues Action Items Log – Revised –03-14-02
3. Master Redlined CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign Framework - Revised 03-07-02
4. Combined CMP Redesign Gap Analysis – Revised 03-14-02
5. CMP Issues Priority 3.5.02 TMC final_ATT List_prioritized – 03-06-02
6. Ranking of AT&T Priority List Items – 03-06-02
7. AZ 271 Comments on ATT's List of CMP Issues_Covad – 03-08-02
8. AZ 271 CMP Critical Outstanding Issues WCom Comments – 03-08-02
9. Karen Clauson email to Redesign Team – 01-28-02
10. Qwest Proposed TERMS Language - 03-13-02
11. Qwest Product-Process Change Postponement Arbitration Language - 03-13-02
12. CMP Re-Design Core Team Expectations – 10-31-01
13. Schedule of CMP Redesign Working Sessions - Revised 03-14-02
14. February 7, 2002 - Baseline Document - 03-11-02
15. Regulatory CR Implementation Language 03-13-02
16. Qwest Proposed Revised Product-Process CR Process - 03-13-02

Attachment 2a

Monday, March 18 and Tuesday, March 19, 2002 (9 AM to 5 PM)
1005 17th Street, 1st Floor, Junior Board Room, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 1-877-550-8686 Conference ID: 2213337 (hit #)

AGENDA—Monday, March 18 (9 AM to 5 PM MT)

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction (9 AM – 9:15 AM MT) Qwest	Judy Schultz,
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Take attendance and review agenda (Email Attachment 1) Judy Lee, Facilitator	
Discussion and Status (9:15 AM – 4:45 PM MT) (including a 10-minute morning and afternoon break and lunch)	All
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ATT List of CMP Priority Issues (Email Attachment 5 and 6)• Review Covad and WCom Comments to ATT List of CMP Priority Issues (Email Attachments 7 and 8) <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Discuss and agree on CONCEPT for remaining items known as Rank “1” from the March 5-7 session○ Discuss and close on language for rank “1” items (Email Attachments 15, 16, and 11)<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Method of Implementation for Regulatory Changes• Product/Process CR Process• Delay of Implementation for disputed Product/Process issues○ Determine value of each issue (1 or 0)○ Determine ranking for “1’s” and○ Determine ranking for “0’s” items (ATT, Covad and WCom issues)	
Next Working Session (4:45 – 5:00 PM MT)	All
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Determine topics for next day	
Adjourn	

Attachment 2a

Monday, March 18 and Tuesday, March 19, 2002 (9 AM to 5 PM)
1005 17th Street, 1st Floor, Board Room, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 1-877-550-8686 Conference ID: 2213337 (hit #)

AGENDA—Tuesday, March 19 (9 AM to 5 PM MT)

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction (9 AM – 9:15 AM MT) Qwest	Judy Schultz,
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Take attendance and review agenda (Email Attachment 1) Judy Lee, Facilitator	
Discussion and Status (9:15 AM – 4:45 PM MT) (including a 10-minute morning and afternoon break and lunch)	All
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ATT List of CMP Priority Issues (Email Attachments 5 and 6)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Continue discussion and consensus on CONCEPT for remaining Rank “1” items○ Discuss and agree on CONCEPT for remaining Rank “0” items○ Discuss and close on language for those items considered Rank “0”	
Next Working Session (4:30 – 5:00 PM MT)	All
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Determine topics for next working session• Review schedule for future sessions	
Adjourn	

Attachment 2b

Announcement Date: March 18, 2002
Effective Date: March 19, 2002
Document Number: CMP.
Notification Category: CMP
Target Audience: CLECs, Resellers

Subject: Revised Agenda for the March 19, 2002 Qwest-CLEC Working Session to Modify the Change Management Process

The revised agenda for Tuesday, March 19, 2002 Change Management Process Re-design working session with the Core Team is attached for your reference.

Date: Tuesday, March 19, 2002

Location: **NOTE: NEW MEETING LOCATION**
Tuesday - 1005 17th Street, 1st Floor, Board Room, Denver, CO

Time: 9 AM to 5 PM Mountain Time

Conference Bridge: Dial-In Number: 877.550.8686
Conference ID: 2213337#

The agenda will be posted on the web site along with meeting material:
<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/redesign.html>.

Sincerely,

Qwest

Attachment 2b

MEETING MATERIAL

17. CMP Redesign Meeting March 19 Notice and Revised Agenda – 03-18-02
18. CMP Redesign Core Team Issues Action Items Log – Revised –03-14-02
19. Master Redlined CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign Framework - Revised 03-07-02
20. Combined CMP Redesign Gap Analysis – Revised 03-14-02
21. CMP Issues Priority 3.5.02 TMC final_ATT List_prioritized – 03-06-02
22. Ranking of AT&T Priority List Items – 03-06-02
23. AZ 271 Comments on ATT's List of CMP Issues_Covad – 03-08-02
24. AZ 271 CMP Critical Outstanding Issues WCom Comments – 03-08-02
25. Karen Clauson email to Redesign Team – 01-28-02
26. Qwest Proposed TERMS Language - 03-13-02
27. Qwest Product-Process Change Postponement Arbitration Language - 03-13-02
28. CMP Re-Design Core Team Expectations – 10-31-01
29. Schedule of CMP Redesign Working Sessions - Revised 03-14-02
30. February 7, 2002 - Baseline Document - 03-11-02
31. Regulatory CR Implementation Language 03-13-02
32. Qwest Proposed Revised Product-Process CR Process - 03-13-02
33. Late Adder CR Language – 03-18-02

Attachment 2b

Monday, March 18 and Tuesday, March 19, 2002 (9 AM to 5 PM)
1005 17th Street, 1st Floor, Junior Board Room, Denver, CO
Conference Bridge: 1-877-550-8686 Conference ID: 2213337 (hit #)

REVISED AGENDA—Tuesday, March 19 (9 AM to 5 PM MT)

TOPIC	LEAD
Introduction (9 AM – 9:15 AM MT) Qwest	Judy Schultz,
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Take attendance and review agenda (Email Attachment 1) Judy Lee, Facilitator	
Discussion and Status (9:15 AM – 4:45 PM MT) (including a 10-minute morning and afternoon break and lunch)	All
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ATT List of CMP Priority Issues (Email Attachments 5 and 6)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Discuss and agree on CONCEPT for remaining items known as Rank “1” from the March 5-7 session<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ V.c.○ III. Part H○ Discuss and close on language for rank “1” items (Email Attachments 11, 15, and 16)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Method of Implementation for Regulatory Changes○ Product/Process CR Process○ Delay of Implementation for disputed Product/Process issues○ Discuss and close on CONCEPT for “0’s” items (ATT, Covad and WCom issues)	
Next Working Session (4:45 – 5:00 PM MT)	All
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Determine topics for next day	
Adjourn	

Attachment 3

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL

Chairman

JAMES M. IRVIN

Commissioner

MARC SPITZER

Commissioner

**IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S
COMPLIANCE WITH § 271 OF THE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996**

)
) **Docket No. T-00000A-97-0238**
)
) **AT&T'S LIST OF PRIORITY CMP**
) **ISSUES**
)
)
)

AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc. and TCG Phoenix (collectively, "AT&T") hereby file their list of priority issues regarding the Change Management Process ("CMP") of Qwest Corporation ("Qwest"). At the Arizona Workshop held on February 25, 2001, the Arizona Corporation Commission Staff requested that AT&T identify the open CMP Redesign¹ issues that must be closed prior to Qwest obtaining section 271 approval. TR. 232 (Feb. 25, 2002).

As AT&T stated in its comments filed with the Commission on February 19, 2002 ("AT&T's February CMP Comments"), there are a large number of significant issues that remain open and need to be closed (by agreement or impasse resolution) before Qwest may be considered to meet the FCC's requirements for an effective change management process. It is very difficult to draw a line placing the necessary items "above the line" and other items "below the line." There are definitely issue that alone are significant enough that, without resolution, Qwest's CMP cannot be considered in compliance with

Attachment 3

section 271. There are other issues that *individually* may not justify a finding of non-compliance with section 271 but when considered as a group, in whole or in part, justify a finding of non-compliance with section 271.² In addition, because a good deal of work must still be done to redesign CMP, the parties have not yet identified all issues. These as yet unidentified issues may be significant as well.

The following is AT&T's attempt to identify the most critical CMP issues that must be resolved prior to finding that Qwest's CMP complies with the FCC's section 271 requirements. The following references to "Part ____" are to AT&T's February CMP Comments. For a fuller description of the issues described under the Parts, please see AT&T's February CMP Comments.

I. Part A. AT&T considers all of the issues identified in Part A of AT&T's February CMP Comments as necessary for section 271 approval.³ AT&T's attempt at prioritizing these issues follows; however, please note that many of these issues are very close in their levels of importance:

A.2. State the criteria for Deny (reasons why) for the CR process. (CMP Issues Log #118; CMP Gap Analysis # 59.) 1

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.) 0

A.8. Qwest proposed to re-visit Regulatory type of changes to address performance measure obligations. (CMP Issues Log #169.) This includes the impasse issue briefed in Part D of AT&T's February CMP Comments. X

¹ SATE is not being addressed in CMP Redesign and for that reason is not cited in this summary of issues. However, SATE must meet the Federal Communication Commission's ("FCC") requirements before this component of Qwest's CMP may be evaluated favorably.

² These issues are not incorporated herein but may be found in AT&T's February CMP Comments, including the exhibits thereto.

³ Note that AT&T boiled down a twenty-three page open issues list (the CMP Issues Log) to arrive at these twelve issues. Some of these issues are further described in the CMP Gap Analysis.

Attachment 3

A12. Qwest to propose language on the criteria used to determine method of implementing regulatory changes. (CMP Issues Log # 243.) 1-3/6/02: Qwest agrees to this in concept.

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.) 1

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. 1

There are 3 scenarios that may apply:

- a. A Product & Process CR comes in, at CMP meeting it is determined that the issue should be resolved via mechanized solution, the P&P CR is closed out and is Xref to System CR and is handled in the Systems CMP meeting going forward.
- b. A sys CR comes in and it is determined that a manual solution will work. Close out the sys CR and Xref to P&P CR and track in P&P CMP meetings.
- c. Sys CR w/ interim manual process, it will be tracked as sys CR with an indicator that it is a Combo CR (Sys and P&P). There should be a Xref on both CRs. There may an adhoc clarification meeting required for the transferred CR. The life cycle will remain in tact. CR # will uniquely identified as a Xref CR. The Distribution pkg will identify the cross over CRs for discussion at specific CMP meeting. CR status = Transferred.

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 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. 1-- 2/18/02 Team agreed in concept.

A.10. Qwest to outline 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.) 0

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.) 1

Attachment 3

A.3. Determine whether a process is necessary to address non-coding changes. (CMP Issues Log #137.) 1 3/18/02 Closed per Mitch Menezes

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.) 1

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.” 0

II. Part C. The Regional Oversight Committee (“ROC”) OSS Test. The ROC test of CMP is being handled differently from the Arizona test of CMP because CGE&Y has not conducted an evaluation of the Qwest Change Management process consistent with the requirements of the Master Test Plan (“MTP”) and the Test Standards Document (“TSD”). Both Arizona and ROC tests call for the tests to be comprehensive evaluations of the CMP process that Qwest employs. CGE&Y evaluated the prior process and found it wanting in limited areas and went no further to conduct the range of tests called for by the Arizona testing requirements. The ROC tester has been diligent in its analysis of the CMP and its use by Qwest. There can be no question that the ROC test has identified a number of significant deficiencies in Qwest’s CMP. AT&T believes that resolution of the outstanding Observations and Exceptions in the ROC is required for section 271 approval chiefly because CGE&Y has not conducted the appropriate range of CMP tests called for in the MTP and the TSD. Although the ROC test is separate from the Arizona test, the Arizona Commission should take notice of the ROC Observations and Exceptions and derive the benefit from their resolution by ROC .

Attachment 3

ROC Testing Requirements for CMP (MTP Version 5.1):

Section 23.1 Description (emphasis added)

This test evaluates Qwest's methods and procedures for managing changes to and change requests for OSS interfaces and business processes utilized by CLECs. This test will review Qwest's co-provided industry change management process (CICMP). The test will rely on inspection and review of Qwest documentation and on CLEC interviews.

23.2 Objective

The objective of this test is to determine the adequacy and completeness of procedures for developing, publicizing, conducting, and monitoring change management.

AZ Testing Requirements for CMP (MTP) Section 7.2.5 (emphasis added):

The Change Management Process Evaluation is an evaluation by the Test Administrator with involvement by Qwest, the CLECs, and the Pseudo-CLEC. The Methods and Procedures (M&P) established by Qwest will be acquired. Qwest will be monitored and evaluated on its adherence to its published M&P for change management. Following the collection of documentation, the Test Administrator will identify, discuss, and track available instances of specific OSS Interface new functionality, enhancements and maintenance.

The fact that the separate tests have the same fundamental requirements for the Test Administrator to conduct (italicized passages in the above), and the ROC test is yielding different results than those produced in the Arizona test, requires that the dissimilarity in results be explained.

CGE&Y's recently released Draft Final Report on the Qwest Change Management Process Redesign Evaluation Report (February 21, 2002) fails to provide answers to the issues raised in the TSD, pertinent to the redesigned process. As CGE&Y states, "This report describes the efforts CGE&Y undertook to evaluate Qwest's efforts to re-design its change management process." *CMP DFR at 3*. It does not provide information sufficient to rehabilitate the voids in the CGE&Y Draft Final Report regarding Relationship Management.

Attachment 3

During testing CGE&Y found the CICMP to be deficient, issuing IWOs 1075, 1076, and 1078. It only concludes the process has been improved. It makes no conclusions about the adequacy of Qwest's CMP. AT&T can only conclude that the review of Qwest's CMP is incomplete and the Draft Final Report premature. *AT&T Comments on the CGE&Y Draft Final Report at 33.*

The Arizona record does not have a CGE&Y finding on the adequacy of the Qwest CMP to meet FCC requirements; and the CMP DFR does not help answer the fundamental questions. The ROC results that illuminate the process deficiencies and the breakdowns in Qwest's use of the process are more clearly stated evidence that shows the weaknesses.

It does not appear reasonable to AT&T that the Arizona Commission could find that Qwest's OSS is nondiscriminatory and provides competitive local exchange carriers ("CLECs") a meaningful opportunity to compete while ROC has open Observations and Exceptions on Qwest's CMP.

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

Attachment 3

have input into changes before they are implemented. *See also* CMP Gap Analysis ## 20 – 22 & 114. 1

IV. Part J. Qwest must demonstrate compliance and adherence with the redesigned CMP over time. This has not been demonstrated in Arizona. AT&T is not certain how this will be satisfactorily demonstrated in Arizona, because it appears that this is not part of CGE&Y's review. Of particular concern is the FCC requirement that the CMP be used to implement "at least one significant software release."⁴ Qwest has not shown that it follows its CMP to implement a software release of the pre-ordering, ordering, repair & maintenance or billing interfaces.

V. Additional Significant Issues. Following are additional issues of significance that must be closed prior to a determination that Qwest's CMP complies with the FCC's requirements.

- a. Discussion and documentation of the process for Industry Guideline changes must be completed. (CMP Issues Log # 94.) X
- b. Defined Terms used in the Redlined Draft CMP Document must be concluded. (CMP Issues Log ## 106, 133, 141, 162, 182 & 248.) 0
- 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.) 1
- d. What is CMP's role in rate changes or rate "validation"? (CMP Gap Analysis ## 1 & 2.) 1-- deemed Out-of-Scope 3/18/02 --by all CLECs in the CMP redesign meeting.
- 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.) 0
- f. SGAT Section 12.2.6. (CMP Gap Analysis ## 148 & 149.) 0

⁴ Letter dated September 27, 1999, from Mr. Lawrence E. Strickling, Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, to Ms. Nancy E. Lubamersky, U.S. WEST.

Attachment 3

VI. Conclusion. AT&T must reiterate its concerns regarding the provision of any list that selectively identifies issues raised in AT&T's February CMP Comments that must be resolved by Qwest before a finding of section 271 compliance can be made. It is AT&T's position that Qwest must address all the issues raised by AT&T in AT&T's February CMP Comments. However, AT&T recognizes that the Staff intends to make a recommendation before all the issues are resolved. Because of this, AT&T has identified herein the issues that, at a minimum, should be addressed before any recommendation by Staff is made. Staff should also recognize that, collectively, the sheer volume of unresolved issues prevent any finding of compliance with section 271.

Respectfully submitted this 5th day of March 2002.

**AT&T COMMUNICATIONS
OF THE MOUNTAIN STATES, INC.,
AND TCG PHOENIX**

By: _____

Richard S. Wolters
1875 Lawrence Street, Suite 1503
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: (303) 298-6741

Gregory H. Hoffman
AT&T
795 Folsom St.
San Francisco, CA 94107-1243

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
13G	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Re-visit the redlined CMP framework element, "Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site" at a later working session.	Core Team	Sep 20 Extended to Nov 13 Nov 27-29 TBD	Re-visit this element to insure all items are addressed in the re-designed CMP framework.
69	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	Qwest Status Report	Review redlined document and Qwest status report prior to scheduled filing. 9/18: Qwest to provide documents to participants no later than Sep 27 for review. 10/2: Qwest will continue to provide documents to redesign team for review prior to filings. 12/11 Provide dates for Jan and Feb filing dates	Core Team Andy Crain	On-going	COMPLETED: Andy Crain to distribute documents no later than Sep 27 for re-design team review prior to Oct 2 meeting. Will visit at each meeting. Qwest will update filing status at Dec 10 th meeting. COMPLETED: 01/24/02: Andy Crain will send Status Report to Redesign team for review after the Feb 5-7 working session. 2/5: Qwest will file a Status Report on the 15 th , or next business day, of every month; Redesign Team shall have an opportunity to review and provide comments before the filing.
89	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	CMP Process	What is the process for a CLEC-originated CR deemed proprietary and a process to handle proprietary CLEC questions and comments?	Core Team	Oct 3 Extended Oct 16 Nov 1 TBD	Issue reworded on Oct 30 to address proprietary CLEC questions and comments. 03/14: In some instances, a CLEC may wish to include proprietary information in a CR. To do this the CLEC must identify the proprietary information with bracketed

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/ Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							<p>text, in all capitals, preceded and followed by the words "PROPRIETARY BEGIN" and "PROPRIETARY END," respectively. Qwest will black-out properly formatted proprietary information when the CR is posted to the CR Database and distributed in the CMP Monthly Meeting distribution packet.</p> <p>If a CLEC wishes to ask a question or submit a comment which is of a proprietary nature, the CLEC must communicate directly with the appropriate CMP Manager via email. Such emails must have a subject line beginning with PROPRIETARY COMMENT or PROPRIETARY QUESTION.</p>
100	Action	Sep 20 Meeting	Schedule Working Sessions	Determine the elements for CMP Product/Process	Core Team	Oct 16 Nov 13 TBD	<p>Core Team to do some pre-meeting work to determine additional elements for Product/Process.</p> <p>GAP ANALYSIS #62</p>
104	Action	Oct 2 Meeting (Meagan – Covad)	Parity in changes	Who has responsibility for determining whether or not a change in retail is CLEC impacting and requires notification via the CMP process	Qwest – Judy Schultz	Oct 16 Extended Nov 1 Nov 13 Nov 27-29 Dec 10-11 TBD	<p>Related to #105—to be closed after Core Team reviews sample retail mail-outs.</p> <p>11/29: Need to review Mitch/AT&T questions on insuring parity between retail and wholesale. Add to agenda for the Dec 10-11 next session.</p>

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							3/5: See Gap Analysis GAP ANALYSIS #52
107	Action	Oct 2 Meeting	Scope—Roles and Respon.	<p>Define “Roles and Responsibilities” of Qwest and CLEC representative/s as it appears on Paragraph 3 of the Scope</p> <p>11/1: Define responsibility for a primary and secondary POC and a CMP Team Representative.</p> <p>2/19/02: Regulatory CR – determine what CLEC representative (e.g., POC, SPOC, designated company representative) can present the objection at the meeting.</p> <p>3/6/02 Gap #117: Voter: The Master, p. 48, provides that the primary POC or the alternate may vote. May companies also designate someone to vote (as by proxy)?</p>	Core Team	Nov 1 TBD	<p>11/20: See Qwest Proposed Managing the CMP Language – Revised 11-20-01</p> <p>Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.</p> <p>GAP ANALYSIS #102, 107</p>
108	Action	Oct 2 Meeting	PCAT – Tech Pub Notification	<p>Research tech pubs and PCAT changes that have been released thus far as they relate to 274 workshop commitments. Provide a list of notifications that are to be released</p> <p>10/16: Can Qwest improve the delivery timeframe for previously released changes to PCAT and Tech Pubs?</p> <p>11/29: Do the CLECs still want Qwest to do retroactive red lining?</p>	Qwest – Judy Schultz	<p>Oct 16 Extended Nov 1 Nov 13 Dec 10-11 TBD</p>	<p>Also present at the Oct 17 CMP Product/Process meeting</p> <p>10/16: Already released PCAT changes will be highlighted in Green and will be available March 2002 (estimated 3 months of work).</p> <p>3/5: Qwest cannot improve the delivery timeframe for previously released</p>

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/ Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				Is Qwest able to do retroactive red lining on Tech Pubs and PCATs? 3/5: Qwest to determine what can be done for both PCAT and Tech Pub			changes to PCAT and Tech Pubs.
115	Action	Oct 3 Meeting	SGAT Language	Revisit proposed SGAT language at the conclusion of the Re-Design process.	Core Team	On-going	This refers to SGAT section 12.2.6. GAP ANALYSIS #149
116	Issue	Oct 3 Meeting	New Product Offerings	Are new product offerings brought to CMP as a Change Request? 3/6/02: From GAP Doc # 120: CLECs contend that if a product were technically feasible within Qwest's network, a technically feasible type of interconnection has been created and should be made available to all CLECs on a standardized basis, and to do so, Qwest should create a product and provide product-like cost support. Qwest agrees that there are times when a BFR should be productized, but disagrees with the notion of an arbitrary or predetermined number of BFRs, preferring to rely on judgment based on experience. Staff suggests that Qwest, with CLEC input, develop a series of criteria that would accelerate the productization of BFRs and that this process should be incorporated within the CICMP and subsequently	Core Team	TBD	See Qwest Proposed Product/Process Change Request Initiation Process Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item. 3/6: Address Gap #120 GAP ANALYSIS #62

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				by provisions within the SGAT. Staff, therefore, concludes that this issue should be resolved in favor of the CLECs.			
137	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	Terms	<p>Define Changes to the OSS interfaces that may not require a CLEC to make coding changes but may affect CLEC process or operations.</p> <p>11/29: Determine whether a process is necessary to address non-coding changes.</p>	Core Team	On-going TBD	<p>Related to #110-subcommittee to expand definition</p> <p>11/29: Do a search in the Master Red Line for “Code” and/or “Non-coding” to determine whether a process is needed to address non-coding changes.</p> <p>Non-coding changes may not require a CLEC to make coding changes but may affect CLEC operations or processes.</p> <p>Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.</p> <p>GAP ANALYSIS ##82, 85</p>
148	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	OSS Interface CR Initiation	Specify/clarify process for Qwest-initiated CRs on page 1 of proposed Qwest language document. See AT&T and WorldCom comments in Master Redline.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	Nov 13 Extended Nov 27-29 TBD	Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.
149	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	New OSS Interface CR	Is a CR required for a new OSS interface? And would it go through the Prioritization/Ranking process?	Core Team	Nov 13 Extended Nov 27-29 TBD	<p>11/13:</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. A CR for a new OSS interface may go through prioritization depending on reason for introduction.</p>

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/ Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							<p>Add language to beginning of Master Redline Sections 4, 5 and 6 to reflect that a CR must precede Intro, Change and Retirement of an OSS Interface.</p> <p>Qwest is ready to discuss and close this item.</p> <p>GAP ANALYSIS #51, 77, 80</p>
152	Issue	Oct 31 Meeting	Training	When is Training available when a new GUI is introduced (after the Release Production Date, or is it available with the Final Notice and User Guide)?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	<p>To be addressed during Training element discussion.</p> <p>11/1: Training will be available when the Final notice is issued by Qwest.</p> <p>Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.</p> <p>GAP ANALYSIS #78</p>
153	Issue	Oct 31 Meeting	Timelines	Do we need to include language that the timelines under the CMP master redlined are 'defaults'? If so, what is the language to address all timelines such as New/Retired OSS Interface?	Core Team	Nov 13 Extended Nov 27-29 TBD	<p>11/20: This section describes the timelines that Qwest, and any CLEC choosing to implement on the Qwest Release Production Date (date the Qwest release is available for use), will adhere to in changing existing interfaces. For a CLEC converting from a prior release, the CLEC implementation date can be no earlier than the weekend after the Qwest Release Production Date, if</p>

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							production LSR conversion is required. For any CLEC not choosing to implement within X days [JEFF THOMPSON] of the Qwest Release Production Date, Qwest and the CLEC will negotiate a mutually agreed to CLEC implementation time line, including testing. Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.
156	Issue	Oct 31 Meeting	Admin—Notification Methods	Clarify what notices will be communicated to CLECs via email, mail-outs, communiqués, and posted on the web site. 3/18/02 -Add the extract # 3 “Types of Notice” from the Wholesale Communication Initiatives (internal process)—add naming convention.	Qwest— Judy Schultz Core Team	Nov 13 Extended Nov 27-29 TBD	See: Qwest Proposed Managing the CMP Language – 10-22-01 Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item. GAP ANALYSIS #96
158	Action	Nov 1 Meeting	CPAP/PID	What is the process to manage changes to performance reporting, calculation, etc.? How do we handle the overlaps between what is being negotiated at the CMP Redesign and CPAP-like procedures? 11/1: Status at the 11/13 CMP redesign session.	Core Team	Nov 13 Extended Nov 27-29 TBD	CO PUC expected to issue order on Nov 5. 11/13: Becky/CO PUC provided the Team with an overview of the order.
163	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting	CR Process	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.	Core Team	Nov 13 Extended Nov 27-29 TBD	11/19/01: When a CLEC or Qwest submits a CR which addresses both systems and product/process it will be addressed in the Systems Monthly CMP Meeting.

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/ Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
		Jan 23 Meeting		address this issue.			<p>The CR will follow the CMP and may be transferred from one forum to another if warranted to adequately attend to the request. The Related product or process CR will still be subject to the applicable CMP timelines.</p> <p>1/23/02: A seamless transfer between Product/Process and Systems requests. Identify decision point in the P&P and systems process as to whether the CR is subject to system prioritization. Information to be included in the response as to whether there is a mechanized solution.</p> <p>GAP ANALYSIS # 27, 28</p> <p>3/18/02- Team agree in concept and Qwest to return with proposed language.</p>
169	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting	Regulatory Type of Changes	Qwest proposes to re-visit Regulatory type of change to address performance measure obligations.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	Nov 13 Extended Nov 27-29 Dec 10-11 TBD	<p>Discussion held on 11/13, but Qwest needs more time to consider CLECs comments to not modify existing definition. Qwest to provide position after considering CLECs comments at the next session.</p> <p>IMPASSE ISSUE</p>

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/ Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
172	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting	Roles and Respons.	Review “Managing of CMP” proposal to include overall responsibilities; e.g., Qwest issues prioritization list and CLECs prioritize.	Core Team	TBD	11/20: See Qwest Proposed Managing the CMP Language – Revised 11-20-01 Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.
173	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting	Voting Process	Develop the Voting Process.	Core Team	TBD	
177	Action	Nov 13 Meeting	CMP Implem.	Draft a proposal for a formal implementation of the final changes discussed within the CMP Re-Design to be discussed during the monthly CMP meetings.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	Nov 27-29 TBD	
179	Action	Nov 13 Meeting	Product/ Process Interim CMP	What is CLEC impacting?	Core team	Nov 27-29 TBD	GAP ANALYSIS #22
180	Action	Nov 13 Meeting	Product/ Process Interim CMP process	What is covered under the interim process for Product/Process (e.g., Additional Testing) in terms of Qwest initiated and Regulatory changes	Qwest— Judy Schultz	Nov 27-29 TBD	
187	Issue	Nov 27 Meeting	AT&T issues list Product /Process	#9 from AT&T issues list (including differences due to geography and systems). 12/11 #9a from AT&T issues: define the requirements for establishing a point of contact for CMP related issues that are not followed within Qwest. (CMP help desk?)	Qwest— Judy Schultz	<u>CLOSED</u> <u>Mar 6 (#9)</u> OPEN	01/14: OSS Interfaces do not have any geographical differences, however, there are functional differences that vary by geographic location, like USOCs. 3/6 COMPLETED: #9 is closed; event notifications are reflecting geographical differences.

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/ Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							#9a remains open for discussion
195	Action	Nov 28 Meeting	Post 10.0 PID/PAP CRs	<p>Provide the CRs (information) for PID/PAP changes for which Qwest would want an exception to the CMP prioritization process. 12-11-01 Included what the system changes will be and how it will provide the performance improvement.</p> <p>3/6: If the Colorado Commission decision on PID/PAP CRs goes against Qwest, Qwest will submit the 2 PID/PAP CRs to the CLECs to be inserted into the 11.0 prioritization list as "Late Adders".</p> <p>If decision is for Qwest, Qwest will treat PID/PAP CRs as above-the-line.</p>	Qwest-Teresa Jacobs	Dec 10 11 TBD	<p>The following 10.0 candidates have been defined: CR #30623 On time jeopardy notification improvements</p> <p>CR #25379 Enhancement to accept and format orders for LSR requests with ACT=T for Unbundled Loop.</p> <p>CR #25381 Reject requests for conversion from Remote Call Forward for UBL</p> <p>3/6/02: List and provide IMA 11.0 PID/PAP CRs to Redesign Team.</p>
197	Action	Nov 28 Meeting	End-to-End Milestones for OSS and Product/ Process	<p>Provide the end-to-end development life cycle and time interval for each milestone for systems and Product & Process CRs. 12-11-10 Provide best case scenarios for stand alone product & process, systems; most likely scenarios for systems and factors that could contribute to longer implementation time frames for Product & Process.</p> <p>3/6/02: Determine where to insert the End-to-End timeline into the Red Line Doc.</p>	Qwest-Teresa Jacobs Judy Schultz	TBD	<p>11/28: The "IMA Release Timeline/Milestone" will be available by the next redesign session. This timeline will provide an overview of Qwest's development cycle for further discussion on Prioritization.</p> <p>01/22: Systems timeline was presented at CMP Redesign.</p>

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
212	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	CR Initiation	Review AT&T proposal (and draft language) that: For regulatory or industry change CRs, originator of CR must provide specific information in the CR identifying what makes the CR a regulatory change or industry guideline change. Such information must include specific references to regulatory or court orders, legislation, industry guidelines as well as dates, docket or case number, page numbers and the mandatory implementation date, if any.	Qwest— Andy Crain	TBD	01/28: This Action Item is addressed in the document which captures Qwest's understanding of the CLEC prioritization proposal. 3/6/02: Pending CO PUC decision; add language to address the regulatory citing for PID/PAP CRs. GAP ANALYSIS #48
214	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	CR Initiation Process – OSS Interface	Review the CR process to insure that the description of the output of each step of the process is clearly defined	Qwest— Andy Crain Core Team	TBD	
215	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	Exception Process	Develop proposed language for exception process for the core team to review. From Action Item 126: What process allows CRs to be submitted less than the agreed upon timeframe for CR presentation at the upcoming CMP meeting? Will the Exception Process accommodate this situation?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	Refer to Gap Analysis. GAP ANALYSIS #137
216	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	Issue Management	Qwest to outline what the guidelines are for when an issue is appropriate for the CMP vs. when the Account team should handle it.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	GAP ANALYSIS #165

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/ Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
217	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	Addendum Documentation and Software (Changes to An Existing OSS Interface)	Qwest to develop language regarding addenda to release software and documentation. How is it done? How is it communicated? How is it documented? Are CLECs ever consulted?	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	TBD	<p>01/28: Following is a high level overview of the current disclosure, release and addendum process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Developer Worksheets -- 45 days prior to a release the draft Developer Worksheets are made available to the CLEC's. • Final Disclosure – 5 weeks prior to a release the Final Disclosure documents, including I charts and developer worksheets are made available to the CLECs. • Release Day – On release day only those CLECs using the IMA GUI are required to cut over to the new release. • 1st Addendum – 2 weeks after the release the 1st addendum is sent to the CLECs. • Subsequent Addendum's – Subsequent addendum's are sent to the CLECs after the release as needed. There is no current process and timeline. • EDI CLECs – 6 months after the release those CLECs using EDI are required to cut over to the new release. CLECs are not required to support all new releases.

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item. GAP ANALYSIS #82
218	Issue	Dec 11 Meeting	Qwest Initiated Product/Process CR	Revisit Qwest initiated Product/Process change process. There is an issue around its use after redesign is complete. There are issues around what is "CLEC-affecting". Do CLECs get to vote on "CLEC-impacting" changes?	Core team	TBD	12/12: Including closed CMP CR number PC112901-01/AI 121201-4 (CR not directly related to a TI or a 271 workshop ruling) 01/28: See Qwest Proposed Product/Process Change Request Initiation Process Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.
219	Issue	Dec 11 Meeting	Implementation of Interim Process for Product/Process	Implementation of interim processes. Qwest should come back to the Core Team at redesign meetings with questions/concerns about implementing what is agreed to in redesign. This will insure that the implementation meets both groups' expectations, resolve ambiguities and enable (and may drive) clarification of the redesigned process in the Master Redline [this should be a standing agenda item].	Core team	Ongoing	Related to #222
222	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	Implementation of Process for Product/Process	Provide timeline to implement the interim product & process change process.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	Dec 21 TBD	Email to redesign team. Related #219, 231
224	Action	Dec 11	Similar CRs	Qwest to develop language to	Qwest—	TBD	01/10:

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
		Meeting		address how the CMP will handle similar CRs and a housekeeping method for old CRs. 3/6/02: Review the Archive CR site and reorganize it to make it easier to navigate.	Judy Schultz		CMP database cross- references similar CRs. Closed CRs will be archived and posted to the CR Archive page, http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/archive.html 3/6/02: Karen Clauson will provide input to Jim Beers and cc Jim Maher. GAP ANALYSIS #109
225	Action	Jan 22 Meeting	Tiers of Notification – Product/ Process	Visit web site for recent notification and identify examples for Tier I and II from the Tiers of notification. Include the comment and holding tank process for the different Tiers.	Core Team	TBD	
226	Action	Jan 22 Meeting	Status of Product/ Process Implementation during Escalation or Dispute	What is the status of a change when the escalation or dispute resolution is invoked? Develop language for “STAY” and parameters for 3 rd party arbitrator	Qwest— Andy Crain	TBD	Determine one of the options: - Qwest moves forward with the implementation - Hold (stay) - Delay
227	Action	Jan 22 Meeting	SGAT Language	Clarify SGAT language on CMP in sections 2.3.1 and 12.2.6, in addition, add language that states that CMP will not supersede an ICA. 3/6: Check SGAT section 2.3 for language	Qwest— Andy Crain	TBD	01/29: Activities in CMP shall not be construed to override or amend the interconnection agreement between Qwest and any CLEC. 3/6/02 Mitch will provide the SGAT language that is in section 2.3
229	Action	Jan 22 Meeting	Job Aid— Documentation	Create job aid for documentation review; e.g., Holding tank vs.	Qwest— Judy	TBD	3/6/02 Kim Kessler ready to provide

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
		Meeting	Documentation	operational version	Judy Schultz		
230	Action	Jan 22 Meeting	Role of CMP Group for Tech Pub and PCAT	What is the role of the CMP group (monthly) in the Tech Pub and PCAT proposed changes in the non-interim term?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	
231	Action	Jan 22 Meeting	CMP Improvements Matrix	Judy Schultz to add clarity to improvements matrix presented to the Re-Design team on 1-22	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	Mitch Menezes/ATT to provide input to Judy Schultz Related to #219, 222 3/18/02: Qwest to provide clarification as to when the individual items were implemented. Re. Liz Balvin's comments. Qwest to update matrix.
234	Action	Jan 24 Meeting	Qwest Initiated Process Change	Draft the potential impasse issue on the request for a Stay during the product & process implementation period	Qwest— Beth Woodcock	Jan 30 TBD	Share with Redesign Core Team
239	Action	Feb 5 Meeting	Product Process CR initiation	Develop language around how to move items from level 3 to level 4	Qwest— Andy Crain	TBD	
240	Action	Feb 6 Meeting	Test Environment	Add language to CR initiation process for CRs (adding products) to the test environments	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	TBD	3/6/02: Needs to be adopted into the Red line.
243	Action	Feb 7 Meeting	Prioritization – Regulatory Change	Qwest to propose language on the criteria used to determine method of implementing regulatory changes	Qwest— Judy Schultz	Feb 19 TBD	2/19: Redesign Team discussed Qwest proposed language. Qwest to modify proposal based on the discussions.
245	Action	Feb 7 Meeting	Terms	AI 106: 10/2: Define terms used in Paragraph 2 in the body of the document (scope and introduction)	Core Team	Feb 14 TBD	AI 106: 11/30: See TERMS document AI 133: 11/30: See TERMS document

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/ Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				<p>and in the glossary of terms table on page 41 of the Master Red lined document. What is OBF's definition? Terms: Design, Development, Notification, Testing, Implementation and Disposition.</p> <p>AI 133: 10/16: Define "major" and "point" OSS interface releases. Define "Release".</p> <p>AI 141(TO BE INCLUDED IN THE MASTER REDLINE IN ADDITION TO THE TERMS SECTIONS): 10/30: Define what will be included in the Technical Specifications.</p> <p>AI 162: 11/1: Define "CLEC", "Qwest" and "sub-systems"</p> <p>AI 182: 11/13: Define migration testing and new release testing (Initial Implementation Testing), and Regression Testing, Controlled Production Testing, Interoperability Testing, SATE in the "terms" section of the red lined document.</p> <p>AI 248: 2/7: Define 'eligible change request'</p> <p>Review all proposed Terms language and provide comments to Jim Maher</p>			<p>AI 141: 12/11: Qwest is prepared to include the following language in the Master Redlined Framework and close this issue: The technical specifications include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A chapter for each transaction or product which includes a business (OBF forms to use) description, a business model (electronic transactions needed to complete a business function), trading partner access information, mapping examples, data dictionary <p>Appendices may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer Worksheets • IMA Additional Edits (edits from backend OSS systems) • Develop Worksheets Change Summary (field by field, release by release changes) • EDI Mapping and Code Conversion Changes (release by release changes) • Facility Based Directory Listings • Generic Order Flow Business Model <p>AI 162: 11/30: See TERMS Document</p>

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							AI 182: 11/30: See TERMS Document 2/14: ATT provided comments. Qwest is prepared to discuss and close action item.
249	Action	Feb 19 Meeting	Regulatory Change	Discuss regulatory change for Product/Process CRs and implications of attempting to mechanize as a Regulatory Systems CRs at a later date	Core Team	TBD	
250	Action	Feb 19 Meeting	Regulatory CR Tracking	Determine how a regulatory CR is logged and tracked	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	
251	Action	Feb 19 Meeting	CR initiation	Reorganize the CR initiation process for the four different types	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	
252	Action	Feb 19 Meeting	Industry Guideline	Address if Regulatory method of implementation process is applicable to industry guideline	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	
253	Action	Feb 22 CMP Systems Meeting (Wicks)	Prioritization	From Feb 21 CMP Systems Meeting. Address how Qwest will address CRs that are part of a package for a release, but that fall out after prioritization is completed for the subsequent release. 3/6/02: From GAP Doc #117--During one of the last votes, Eschelon used three votes for its priority CRs but	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	TBD	

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
				later found out that the CRs were collapsed into one change. Need a documented process to identify this earlier, when possible, so that a carrier may use votes wisely.			
254	Action	Mar 6 Meeting	Prioritization Document	Add language to the Prioritization Document to describe the "Late Adder" process	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	TBD	
255	Action	Mar 6 Meeting	Cross-reference Action Item Log with Gap Analysis	Combine the Action Item list with the GAP analysis and cross-reference the action items on the GAP doc.	Qwest— Jim Maher	TBD	
256	Action	Mar 6 Meeting	CR Prioritization Ballot	Revise the CR Prioritization Ballot for to include the above the line CRs with LOE estimates.	Qwest— Judy Schultz (Buck)	TBD	
257	Action	Mar 7 Meeting	Duplicate CR Process	Add language to address duplicate CRs	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	
258	Action	Mar 7 Meeting	Consensus Identification of Critical Issues	Identify and document the Concept consensus.	Judy Lee	Mar 11	3/11: Consensus document share with Redesign team. 3/13: ATT provided comments for consideration. Covad and WCom responded as agreeing to ATT's comments.
259	Action	Mar 7 Meeting	Proposed Language on Critical List Items	Develop the proposed language for the SCRP, CR process, prioritization, Regulatory Change method of implementation, and P&P implementation suspension.	Beth Woodcock	Mar 13	Send to all redesign participants by Friday prior to 3/19/02 meeting. 3/19: Regulatory Change document and Postponement of Product/Process Implementation document shared with

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
							Redesign Team.
260	Action	March 18 Meeting	Help Desk Process	Insure a tighter working relationship between the ISC and Wholesale systems help desk when a system problem requires the ISC to implement a manual work around in order to insure proper handling of LSRs during the time of system trouble.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	Mar 19	Qwest to provide outline on concept. 3/19: After discussion with ISC SMEs, the Redesign Team discussed and agreed on concept on how to handle system problems, and process problems.
261	Action	March 18 Meeting	CR transfer process	Craft Language to address the 3 scenarios that were added to item A7 in the AT&T Issues Doc.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	
262	Action	March 18 Meeting	PID PAP Process	Document relationship between CMP and the forum to administer the PIDs long term. Also, a need to identify where in the red line to insert language.	ATT— Mitch Menezes	TBD	
263	Action	March 18 Meeting	Non CMP Mailouts	Look into the mailout process-CMP vs. non-CMP. E.g. Interconnection agreement terms on notice.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	
264	Action	March 18 Meeting	Rate & Rate Validation	Create language under scope to address that rate changes and rate processes are not within CMP but through interconnection agreements which are addressed individually	Qwest— Andy Crain & Beth Woodcock	TBD	
265	Action	March 19 Meeting	Mail-out Notice	Add a disclaimer notice to mailouts that indicates “This mailout is not intended to modify or supercede an existing SGAT, Interconnection agreement, ...”	Qwest— Judy Schultz	TBD	

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Re-design Working Sessions
Core Team Issues/Action Items Log—OPEN**

Attachment 4

Revised—March 19, 2002

#	Issue/ Action	Date Originated	Category	Description	Owner	Due Date	Resolution/Remarks
266	Action	March 19 Meeting	Core team Conference call	<p>Set up an ad-hoc call to discuss the leveling of the mailout notices.</p> <p>Prior to the call, each participant should review the list of mailouts and place each notice into category 1,2,3,or 4 to be reviewed during the call.</p> <p>Qwest will go back for a reasonable amount of time and add a description to the matrix and send the list notices out to the Core Team by noon on Monday 3/25/02.</p> <p>The CLECs will provide their responses back to Qwest by noon on Wednesday 3/27/02.</p> <p>Qwest will provide the compiled summary back to the CLECs by COB Wednesday. The actual notices can be found on the web. (Qwest will send out the directions to the location on the web with the original list on Monday)</p>	Jim Maher And Core Team	3/28/02 9AM MT	

**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	3 rd Party Provider Role	<p>What role do 3rd Party Providers play in this re-design effort?</p> <p>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]</p> <p>b) 3rd Party Providers are allowed to ‘voice’ and ‘vote’ as any CLEC in this re-design effort [Process and Vote=Yes]</p> <p>c) 3rd Party Providers are excluded from the core team [Process and Vote=No]</p> <p>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]</p>	Core Team	CLOSED July 19	<p>DECISION:</p> <p>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.</p>
1B	Action	July 11 Meeting	3 rd 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	<p>DECISION:</p> <p>Yes, if a Letter of Authorization is</p>

**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
							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
1H	Action	July 19 Meeting	Voting	Seek written permission from July 19 participants if 3 rd 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	Baseline	Create a single document that inserts	Judy Lee	CLOSED	COMPLETED:

**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
		Meeting	Document	CLEC comments on areas for improvement in Qwest’s CMP into the appropriate sections of the OBF 2233 version 2 framework		July 19	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	CMP Redesign Web Site	Enhance the CMP web site to include the CMP Redesign information	Qwest— Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED. See CMP web site for “CMP 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. 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 CMP Re-design web site.	Qwest— Mark Routh	CLOSED July 19	COMPLETED: Matrix is posted on the 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
7B	Action	July 11 Meeting	Written Permission to Post CLEC Comments	Seek clearance in writing from individual CLECs to post their comments on the CMP 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 CMP CMP 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. DECISION (8/7): Recommendation to rename from CMP to CMP will be presented at 8/15 CMP Meeting DECISION: (8/15) CLECs agreed to change CMP 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

**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
							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.
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	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: Rollout to CLEC community at the 9/19 Monthly CMP meeting. COMPLETED: Qwest presented mockup at the 9/5 re-design meeting.
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	CMP Web Site	Review CMP web-site and suggest potential changes and guidelines	Core team	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Included in 8/8 redlined CMP framework
13B	Action	August 7 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Can Qwest display new naming convention on the CMP 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

**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
13C	Action	August 7 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Provide location (link) where all notification documents are kept – Wholesale web site	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 20	COMPLETED: Jarby Blackmun shared proposed screen shots with Core Team on 9/5. Related to Items #13F, 37, 44, and 61.
13D	Action	August 7 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add English title to all new and existing CRs posted on the CMP web site	Qwest – Mark Routh Matt Rossi	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Matt and Mark have updated the web sites to add the requested information.
13E	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP 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	COMPLETED: Qwest is currently doing this today and will continue on all updated pages
13F	Action	August 8 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Develop timeframe to roll-out web site and mail-out process	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 20	Per Jarby Blackmun, Qwest is targeting early November to deploy modifications to CMP web site.
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
14D	Action	August 7 Meeting	Notification Process	Take existing system, product and process notification and modify to match proposed naming convention to obtain	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: Qwest will adopt a single naming convention for notifications.

**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
				one single naming convention for all notifications			Progress will be monitor at the Monthly CMP meetings.
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 (i.e., one for Product and another for Process but with the same content)?	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 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.
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	CLOSED Oct 2	COMPLETED: Element revisited on Sep 18 and 20 with action taken by Core Team and Qwest to further discuss on Oct 2 and 3.
17B	Issue	August 7 Meeting	Scope	Describe Qwest’s position for systems and functionality supported in the current CMP process (i.e., EXACT,	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: August 14 discussion provided a definition for OSS Interfaces that

**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
				HEET)			includes system functionality.
17C	Action	August 7 Meeting	Scope	Dialogue on introduction and scope to seek input from CLECs to prepare for Qwest's proposal on September 20 th	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: Qwest will provide proposal on Sep 20 for discussion.
18	Action	July 19 Meeting	PIDs	WorldCom will provide the Core Team members with the latest PIDs for Change Management.	WorldCom Liz Balvin	CLOSED August 7	COMPLETED: Liz Balvin sent PIDs on July 20 th
19	Issue	July 19 Meeting	Contact Information	Eschelon requested that contact information for all participant be included on the CMP 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 CMP web site
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.

**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
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 allowed to vote on any issue in which they did not participate.
23	Action	August 7 Meeting	Upcoming Event Calendar	Provide an “up coming” events page on the CMP web site that includes all monthly meetings, re-design meetings and any other interim ad hoc meetings/calls	Qwest – Mark Routh, Matt Rossi	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Calendar is on the web site.
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	CLOSED Oct 16	Response is quite slow from the CLEC community, therefore Qwest is calling and asking CLECs to respond with contact information. In addition, Qwest to publicize the need for POC information at the Qwest sponsored CLEC Forums. 10/3:Per Jim Maher—90% complete—will go on web

**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
							COMPLETED: 10/16 – on the CMP web site as CR Manager POC, Team Representative and Alternate Contact
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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

**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
							web site (by Tuesday, 8/14)
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.
30	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add Meeting Agenda, material, dates to web site CMP category	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Began with August 14 and 16 meeting minutes
31	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Change category Ordering to Ordering/Provisioning and Repair to Repair/Maintenance	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
32	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add Raw Loop Data Tool to the IMA GUI section of web site categories for Systems	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
33	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add another sub-category of “Other” for systems with possible expansion later after re-visit of the scope discussion.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
34	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Investigate adding back end systems to the sub categories of the Systems	Qwest— Judy	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention

**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
				notifications on the web site (WFA, TIRKS, etc)	Schultz		matrix.
35	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Add “procedures” as a sub category (2) to the Process section	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: 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	CMP Web Site	Add “Tariffs” as a main category in the proposed matrix	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Revised Naming Convention matrix.
37	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP 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	CLOSED Sep 20	COMPLETED: Jarby Blackmun provided overview on CMP web site with search capabilities. Demo is available for CLECs on CMP web site.
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. 9/5: Is there flexibility in the process to support CLECs on notices (e.g., Help Desk, Sales Manager)?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 2 (Extended to Oct 17 regular CMP)	Qwest will continue to refer a CLEC to their respective Service Manager if there are questions pertaining to a notification. 9/5: CLECs need to work with their respective Service Manager, and if necessary, speak with the Service Manager’s boss to clarify questions pertaining to a specific notice. 9/18: Toni Dubuque will join Oct 3 session to discuss DECISION: Toni Dubuque to discuss this issue

**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
							with the CLECs at the Oct 17 CMP Product/Process Meeting.
39	Issue	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Provide screen shots of the web site to give visual representation	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: See Jarby Blackmun’s Qwest Wholesale CLEC “Notices On-Line” presentation, dated Sep 4, 2001 on the CMP Re-design web site.
40	Action	August 14 Meeting	Notifications	Are Call Center outages included in the “outages” sub-category – should they be?	Qwest – Judy Schultz Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Mar 5	Qwest will provide notice on the process via mail-out 10/29: Posted on CMP Redesign web site—“Qwest Center Outage Notification Process-Posted 10-29-01” Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item. COMPLETED 2/5: 11/29: Terry Bahner/ATT to review and core team to close at next session. 2/5: Jeff Thompson to provide a 1-pager at the Feb 21 CMP Systems Meeting on process if a Call Center outage should occur. 3/5 COMPLETED: CLECs can review 1 pager on the CMP Redesign Archive page—see 10/29/01 above.
41	Action	August 14	CMP	Add the Re-Design page on the CMP	Qwest –	CLOSED	COMPLETED:

**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
		Meeting	Web Site	section of the Proposed Release Notification matrix	Judy Schultz	Sep 5	Revised Naming Convention matrix.
42	Action	August 14 Meeting	Notification	Investigate how notifications are done for Network outages, including a paging broadcast capability. 9/5: Does the SGAT language pertaining to method of notification for Network outages need to be revised based on Qwest practice?	Qwest – Jim Maher Andy Crain	CLOSED Feb 5	Related to Item #66 Beth Woodcock to contact Andy Crain to provide information at the Oct 30 Nov 1 next session. 11/29: Andy Crain to clarify at next session. Jim Maher to confirm paging process for Network Outages. 01/08/02: Jim Maher – Current notification is via email as denoted in the SGAT. 01/24: Jim Maher to check the CLEC questionnaire to see if the paging option is still on it. 01/28: There is no reference to paging in the CLEC questionnaire. GAP ANALYSIS #98
43	Action	August 14 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Investigate possibilities for displaying (posting) and sorting Sub-category 3 of the web site	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Jarby Blackmun informed the team that search capabilities will include category, sub-category and document number.
44	Action	August 14 Meeting	Notification	Create instructions for access to web site notification	Qwest - Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 20	DECISION: Per Core Team, not required due to simplicity of using the modified CMP web site.
45	Action	August 14	Voting Tally Form	Incorporate Qwest's position on the	Qwest –	CLOSED	COMPLETED:

**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
		Meeting		Voting Tally Form	Judy Schultz	August 16	See Procedures for A Vote and Impasse Resolution Process (includes Voting Tally Form) on the CMP 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	COMPLETED: See proposed Procedures for A Vote and Impasse Resolution Process (includes Voting Tally Form) on the CMP Re-design web site
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 - Terry Bahner	CLOSED Sep 5	DECISION: CLECs will hold a conference call to achieve consensus to resolve an impasse issue.
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	CLOSED Sep 20	COMPLETED: Types of Changes discussed on Sep 20.
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	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Flow chart of change request process was discussed with modifications. Qwest to make modifications (add Denied, Escalated, Deferred and Withdrawn) and present flow chart to the CLEC community at the Sep 19 Monthly CMP meeting.
51	Action	August 16 Meeting	Types of Changes – OBF V.1 Terms	Obtain SGAT language for ‘versioning’ release language. 10/16: Define ‘versioning’	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Nov 29	Pull language on OSS versioning currently in SGAT. “Versioning” will be defined in the Terms session at a later date.

**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: The word “versioning” has been omitted from the master redline language, therefore, a definition is no longer needed at this time.
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	CLOSED Oct 30	COMPLETED: Discussion on Change to Existing Interface completed. “Defects” will be addressed during discussion on Production Support. See Action #99 to capture this item.
53	Action	August 16 Meeting	Qwest CMP Process Document	Revise Qwest CMP 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	CLOSED Nov 29	Qwest to use redlined CMP format for its proposed language 11/29: Closed, this is the ongoing effort of the CMP redesign team.
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	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Began with the August 14 and 16 meeting minutes
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	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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)

**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
							– 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 CMP 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	CLOSED Sep 5	COMPLETED: Refer to CMP Re-design web site for revised final meeting minutes.
57	Action	August 14 Meeting	Meeting Minutes Update	Revise July 19 Final Meeting Minutes to include the voting results on the 3 rd Party Provider issue—on August 14, the last voting CLEC has given Qwest permission to publish its result.	Judy Lee	CLOSED August 21	COMPLETED: Revised Final July 19 Meeting Minutes are posted on the CMP 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 CMP 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.
60	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	CLEC Questionnaire	Verify if there is an entry on the CLEC questionnaire for contact information (POC).	Qwest – Matt Rossi	CLOSED Oct 2	Promote the importance for CLECs to provide accurate contact information at the Qwest sponsored

**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
				Does the questionnaire need to include primary and secondary point-of-contact?		(Moved to general Oct 17 CMP)	CLEC Forum. Primary and Secondary POC information is not entries in the questionnaire. DECISION: Address this issue at the October 17 CMP Product/Process meeting.
61	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	CMP Web Site	Provide an Archive on the CMP web site.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 18	COMPLETED: Archive will remain on the CMP web site
62	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	Re-design Location	Provide location, directions and names of nearby hotels for Minneapolis meetings.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Sep 10	COMPLETED: Information provided to all CMP re-design participants
63	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	CMP Re-design	Provide examples at the Qwest sponsored Sep CLEC Forum of what has been changed as a result of the CMP re-design effort	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 2 (Extended to Oct 17 CMP)	The Qwest sponsored CLEC Forum on September 12-13 was postponed due to the national crisis. This needs to be schedule d around the CMP re-design and monthly CMP meetings. DECISION: Toni Debuque will address at Oct 17 CMP Product/Process meeting
64	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	Denied Change Request	Allegiance to re-introduce a previously denied CR that is still needed so that Qwest can assess and CLECs to prioritize.	Qwest – Mark Routh	CLOSED Sep18	DECISION: Closed as an action item for the re-design effort, but tracked on the OSS Interface CMP action item list
65	Action	Sep 5 Meeting	Re-design Impasse Resolution Process	Obtain feedback from individual organizations on the draft proposed CLEC-Qwest Impasse Resolution Process for the re-design effort.	Core Team	CLOSED Sep 20	COMPLETED: See “CLEC-Qwest CMP Re-design Procedures for Voting and Impasse Resolution Process_09-20-2001” on CMP 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
66	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	271 Workshop SGAT	Qwest to make presentation regarding the SGAT language and how it relates to the process structured by the Core Team.	Qwest – Andy Crain	CLOSED Oct 3	Including Item #42 Discussion held on Sep 18 and 20 with more discussion on Oct 2-3 (re-visit Scope) and prior to the November filing. COMPLETED: Qwest presented language with CLEC discussion on Oct 3
67	Issue	Sep 6 Meeting	271 Workshop SGAT	Do exhibits G (CMP framework) and H (escalation process) need to be in the SGAT?	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 3	Related to Item #66 Discussion held on Sep 18 and 20 with more discussion on Oct 2-3 DECISION: Qwest will include Exhibit G (formerly known as Exhibits G and H) in the SGAT – red lined as it evolves with the re-design
68	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	271 Workshop 18 COIL Items	Review the 18 items and verify that they will be addressed in the CMP re-design	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	DECISION: Closed item because this has already been filed with the CO PUC.
70	Issue	Sep 6 Meeting	CLEC Review of Tech Pubs and PCAT Changes	What is Qwest’s proposal for CLECs to review and provide comments to notices on Tech Pub and PCAT changes – what is the role of the CMP group (monthly) in these proposed changes? 10/16: Issue remains open until the interim process is implemented.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Jan 22	Susie Bliss will provide overview of the process at the Sep 19 CMP product/process meeting. Defer until discussion on Scope is scheduled. Scheduled call on October 5 – Susie Bliss. Minutes posted to Redesign website 10-29-01 Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.

**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: Redesign Team decided to close this item and create a separate issue item to discuss the role of CMP in PCAT and Tech Pub changes.
71	Action	Sep 6 Meeting	Production Support Process	What is the current process for CLECs to report and Qwest to notify CLECs on production problems—what is the production support process and timeline? Where is the CLEC documentation pertaining to this information?	Qwest – Wendy Green	CLOSED Sep 18	COMPLETED: Notification distributed and posted by Tina Hubis on Sep10. Defer to Scope and Section 12 Production Support discussions according to the re-design schedule
72	Issue	Sep 6 Meeting	CR Process	What is the process if the CLEC-originator does not agree with Qwest's reply or the CR is rejected?	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 3	Addressed on Sep 18, 20 during Escalation Process and the Dispute Resolution Process with further discussion during Oct 2-3 session. COMPLETED: Escalation and Dispute Resolution Process
73	Issue	Sep 5 Meeting	Account Management	Clarify roles and responsibility of Service Managers and Sales Managers. What is the internal notification process (e.g., advanced notice before CLEC) for Service Managers on CLEC notices?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 3 (Address at Oct 17 CMP meeting)	Subsequent to the Sep 5-6 session, Qwest requests to address this item at the Oct 3 meeting to allow the Service Management Director to participate in-person in Minneapolis. DECISION: Will address at the Oct 17 Product/Process CMP meeting
74	Issue	Sep 5	CR Process	What is the process if the CLEC-	Core Team	Oct 2	Duplicative of #72

**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
		Meeting	Dispute	originator does not agree with reply or rejected CR			
75	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Redlined Framework	Review the Red-lined working document for successive working sessions	Bahner, Clauson, Maher, Wicks	CLOSED Sep 18	COMPLETED: Jim Maher restructured the MASTER REDLINED CMP Re-design Framework based on input from Core Team members.
76	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation URL	Create URL for Escalated issues to be submitted	Qwest – Schultz	CLOSED Oct 16	Should include issue and proposed solution COMPLETED: URL for Escalation is available for issue and response.
78	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation Posting on Web Site	What is a reasonable time frame for posting an escalation issue and response (e.g., within one business day)?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 16	COMPLETED: Language under Escalation
79	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation Mail-out	Can a mail-out process be established for Escalated items (issue and response)?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 16	Qwest will send email to all CLECs once an escalation has been initiated
80	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation	Draft proposed language regarding time frames for Qwest to provide binding position on an escalated issue (e.g., 7 or 14 calendar days). Also include binding authority language.	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 3	COMPLETED: CLEC and Qwest agreed to a 7-day interval for escalated CRs and 14 days for other non-CR issues. Language reflected in the Master Redline framework.
81	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation	During “14-day” response cycle, will Qwest continue efforts (e.g., CR) or will activity stop?	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 3	DECISION: Requestor may ask that activity stop or continue. Language reflected in the Master Redline framework
82	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Escalation	How are CLECs notified that an issue has been escalated between monthly CMP meetings?	Core Team	CLOSED Sep 20	DECISION: CLECs will be notified via formal notice to access web site for

**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
							information.
83	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Dispute Resolution	Does an issue have to go through the escalation process before it goes through the dispute resolution process?	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 3	DECISION: No
84	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Dispute Resolution	Propose language around dispute resolution ADR process. Do we want to sight specific organizations??	Andy Crain and CLEC Attorneys	CLOSED Oct 3	COMPLETED: Language reflected in Master Redline framework
85	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Dispute Resolution	What is the process for CLEC-CLEC consensus and the Dispute Resolution Process?	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 3	COMPLETED: Language reflected in Master Redline framework
86	Issue	Sep 18 Meeting	Dispute Resolution	When can Why would Qwest invoke the Dispute Resolution Process?	Qwest— Andy Crain	CLOSED Oct 3	Andy can't think of anything – we should leave in anyway. Tom Dixon: Close, but keep in mind that Qwest will probably never use it
87	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Re-design Impasse Resolution	Propose language around the CMP re-design impasse resolution process/dispute resolution process.	Qwest— Andy Crain	CLOSED Oct 3	COMPLETED: Refer to CMP Redesign Procedures on Voting and Impasse Resolution Process document on the CMP Redesign web site.
88	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	CMP Process	Propose language for “proprietary CR”	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	DECISION: Not applicable; no CRs have ever been deemed proprietary. GAP ANALYSIS # 27, 74, 75, 76
90	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Network outage notification	Distribute notification of CLEC questionnaire with Network Outage notification option for pager notification.	Matt Rossi	CLOSED Sep 18	DECISION: An action item for the monthly CMP Product/Process
91	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Introduction and Scope	Define “good faith” and “normal CMP process”-(3.4.1)	Tom Dixon /Beth Woodcock	CLOSED Nov 29	Proposed language provided to redesign via email on Nov 1. Tom Dixon provided the definition in the “Terms” document. The

**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
							definition was added to the Master Red Lined document in the Dispute Resolution section. COMPLETED: Language under Introduction and Scope, and Terms.
92	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	CR Process	Include in the CR Process a step for CLECs to discuss the CR after clarification process and before prioritization.	Core Team	CLOSED Nov 1	Sub-committee to create language and distribute to Core Team by Sep 27. Oct 3: Qwest to put language around these issues Oct 16: Qwest will share proposed language at the next session. Nov 1: Discussed and agreed on CR Initiation Process language.
93	Action	Sep 18 Meeting	Exception Process	What is the process for an Exception item during prioritization?	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	DECISION: There are provisions for 'walk-ons.' GAP ANALYSIS #137
94	Issue	Sep 20 Meeting	CR Process	How will the CR Process address 'draft' industry guideline changes?	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	COMPLETED: See Prioritization Language 02-28-02 GAP ANALYSIS #18
95	Issue	Sep 20 Meeting	Parity	What is the process for discovering retail parity issues after the conclusion of the 271 workshops? 10/16: CLECs to review information on the web site and provide comments at the Oct 30-Nov 1 re-design session.	Core Team	CLOSED Nov 29	Qwest to provide checklist used by Retail to screen change proposals for potential CLEC impacting. Related to #105. 10/16 COMPLETED: This checklist is on the CMP re-design web site under Re-Design

**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
							documentation. 11/29: Close issue, but Mitch will provide Judy Schultz with questions prior to discussion at a future session.
96	Action	Sep 20 Meeting	Intro – Scope	Draft proposed language for introduction and scope for the October 2 meeting	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 2	All Core Team members to share proposed language by Sep 27 with rest of members. Karen Clausen is the lead for CLEC language. DECISION: Re-visit during Product/Process CMP discussions.
97	Action	Sep 20 Meeting	Types of Changes	Have legal personnel verify the intent with the proposed language around types of changes (contractual agreement) for the red lined document.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 3	Language for Types of Changes under Regulatory DECISION: Qwest agree to remove “contractual agreement” language.
98	Issue	Sep 20 Meeting	CR Process	How many days after receipt of the CR will Qwest contact the originator to clarify CR if necessary?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 16	COMPLETED: Language for CR Initiation
99	Action	Sep 20 Meeting	CR Process	Qwest to provide language on Production Support. Also address severity levels and defects.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Nov 29	COMPLETED: Qwest provided the language.
101	Action	Sep 20 Meeting	Schedule Working Sessions	Review the start time of the first day for future working sessions.	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 2	DECISION: Begin at 9am MT—refer to schedule on CMP redesign site
102	Action	Sep 20 Meeting	Schedule Working Sessions	Can Qwest provide net-meeting capability at its location to limit Core	Qwest— Matt Rossi	CLOSED Sep 27	DECISION: Yes – only at Qwest locations

**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
				Team member travel?			
103	Action	Sep 20 Meeting	CMP Re-design Web Site	Clean up the CMP Re-design Web Site to house the latest version of documents.	Qwest— Jim Maher	CLOSED Oct 16	COMPLETED: Archive page set up – date placed on each document
105	Action	Oct 2 Meeting (Dixon – WCom)	Parity	<p>Provide training package and check list used by Qwest to train retail in identifying changes that impact CLECs</p> <p>Provide sample mail outs for retail changes – (Retail only change and Retail CLEC impacting change)</p> <p>Code of Conduct – what is the disciplinary action when guidelines – (includes compliance) are not adhered to</p>	Qwest – Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 5	<p>This replaces # 95; related #104</p> <p>Option 1 – Qwest sends everything</p> <p>Option 2 – Qwest screens notification to only CLEC impacting changes</p> <p>10/16 COMPLETED: This checklist is on the web on the CMP re-design web site under Re-Design documentation</p> <p>11/1: Examples of mail outs for retail changes are posted on the web site and shared as hand-out at the 11/13 session.</p> <p>Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.</p> <p>DECISION: Actions completed</p> <p>GAP ANALYSIS #114</p>
106	Action	Oct 2 Meeting	Definition of terms	<p>Define terms used in Paragraph 2 in the body of the document (scope and introduction) and in the glossary of terms table on page 41 of the Master Red lined document. What is OBF’s definition?</p> <p>Terms: Design, Development, Notification, Testing, Implementation and Disposition.</p>	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	<p>11/30: See Qwest Proposed TERMS Language - 11-30-01</p> <p>Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.</p> <p>DECISION: Combined with #245</p>

**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
							GAP ANALYSIS #139
109	Action	Oct 2 Meeting	PCAT—Tech Pub Notification	Put together a snapshot view of notifications to be released going forward in order to formulate and implement an adequate interim process for CLEC notification for PCA and Tech Pub changes.	Qwest – Judy Schultz (Susie Bliss)	CLOSED Nov 29	Presented during Oct 3 re-design conference call scheduled for Oct 5 to discuss. 10/16: PCAT schedule will be posted by 10/19; Tech Pub and OSS Interface schedules will be posted by 10/26. 11/1: Judy Schultz provided the Core Team with a revised matrix of upcoming notifications. DECISION: Close action item. Qwest will continue to provide the revised notification matrix.
110	Action	Oct 3 Meeting	Terms: CLEC Operating Procedures	Define “CLEC operating procedures” under Terms table in master redline document. 11/1: Subcommittee will provide the Core Team with an expanded definition for CLEC impacting besides the current 4 items.	Qwest— Andy Crain (Susie Bliss) Core Team Sub-Comm. Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	Will be discussed offline on Oct 5 – Susie Bliss (develop checklist) 10/16: Define the term “operating procedures” at a later session. 11/1: Subcommittee (<u>Judy Schultz</u> , Terry Bahner, Terry Wicks, Liz Balvin, Karen Clausen) to present at the 11/13 meeting expanded list of CLEC impacting situations. Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item. DECISION: Close—allow redesign to baseline process

**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
							GAP ANALYSIS #139
111	Issue	Oct 3 Meeting	Document	<p>CLEC consensus on “red lining” document changes and to include a running log in front of the document highlighting the changes</p> <p>10/16: Provide samples of historical change logs for Core Team to review and discussion.</p>	Judy Lee	CLOSED Nov 29	<p>CLECs need to see sample of red-lined document and historical change log</p> <p>10/16: Sandy Evans provided Judy Lee with a sample from BellSouth. Judy Lee to share samples with the Core Team at the next session.</p> <p>10/30: Samples of historical change logs were shared with Core Team and posted on the web site.</p> <p>COMPLETED: 11-29-01 Core Team provided input to Qwest. Related to Issues 201-203.</p>
112	Issue	Oct 3 Meeting	Document	Provide determination on whether or not Qwest can go back and “red line” as per the committed to going forward process for document change notification and if so – how far back	Qwest – Judy Schultz (Dana)	CLOSED Oct 16 (canceled)	Duplicate item to #108 and 109
113	Issue	Oct 3 Meeting	Interim Exception Process	How do you call a special CMP meeting outside of the general CMP meeting? Re-visit interim exception process.	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 3	DECISION: Refer to Interim Exception Process on CMP redesign web site.
114	Issue/Action	Oct 3 Meeting	CLEC Impacting Check Sheet	<p>Put together internal check sheet to assist Qwest in assessing whether a change is CLEC impacting</p> <p>Susie to set up a meeting with the CLECs to discuss on Oct 5.</p>	Qwest – Judy Schultz (Susie Bliss)	CLOSED Oct 29	<p>Attendees include – but are not limited to:</p> <p>Allegiance WCom Eschelon AT&T</p>

**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
				10/16: Qwest to distribute minutes from the 10/5 Susie Bliss call and to share with the re-design Core Team the check sheet at the next session.			10/16: Several items were stated with the idea that this list will be 'living' and will be updated as necessary. Qwest to share minutes from Oct 5 Susie Bliss call and the check sheet to determine if a change is CLEC impacting at the next session. COMPLETED: Meeting minutes to the Oct 5 conference call has been posted: CMP Re-design web site, titled "CMP Redesign CLEC-Qwest Conference Call Oct 5 Final Minutes – 10-29-01."
117	Issue	Oct 3 Meeting	CMP Re-design Location	Should the team re-check the location for the Oct 30, 31 and Nov 1 redesign meeting? Does it make sense to move the meeting to Denver?	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 3	DECISION: Eschelon, Integra and Allegiance will meet in Denver (originally planned for Minneapolis). Sprint may join in Denver or via phone.
118	Action	Oct 3 Meeting	Criteria and process for Deny	State the criteria for Deny (reasons why) for the CR process. Address the process, if any, for declining a CR for reason such as scope. (Within first 2 business days after receiving the CR)—GAP #197	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 7	Criteria examples: Specific regulatory ruling Qwest Policy Business (e.g., Cost) COMPLETED: Discussed and agreed on reasons for denial of a CR and the process of denying a CR. GAP ANALYSIS #57, 60

**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
119	Action	Oct 3 Meeting	Video Conference	Can Qwest provide video conferencing capability for the CMP redesign meetings?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Oct 16	DECISION: Small rooms – 20 people – we got more speakers now in Denver.
120	Action	Oct 2 Meeting	Qwest’s Status Report Filing	Determine what should be ‘highlighted’ in the Master Redline framework to show element/s discussed.	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 16	COMPLETED: Red lined master included in filing
121	Action	Oct 2 Meeting	Qwest’s Status Report Filing	Timeframe for CLEC review of Qwest’s Status Report – CLEC comments to Andy no later than close of business Fri, Oct 5 – Andy Crain issues revised document by Mon, Oct 8 COB – Additional CLEC comments to Andy by Tues, Oct 9 5pm MT – Qwest files Wed, Oct 10	Core Team Andy Crain	CLOSED Oct 16	COMPLETED: Oct 2: Andy Crain shared draft Status Report with redesign Core Team
122	Issue	Oct 2 Meeting	Source of Change	How should Qwest display ‘source of change’ in documents?	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 3	DECISION: Show SOURCE as a identifier on mail-out letters and include all sources with details in the historical change log.
123	Issue	Oct 3 Meeting	Interim Process	Do we agree to adopt the Proposed Interim CMP CR workflow for Product and Process as language included (but not limited to) in the Master Redlined framework. – Want a final review of proposed redlined language	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 16	COMPLETED: Andy Crain provided a redlined document proposal for Core Team review
124	Issue	Oct 3 Meeting	Qwest’s Status Report Filing	CLECs request Qwest to refer in the Status Report that the entire redlined document is an interim draft (not final but operational) until final approval by all parties has been completed.	Qwest— Andy Crain	CLOSED Oct 16	COMPLETED: Master Redlined is now noted as Interim Draft.
125	Issue	Oct 3 Meeting	Interim Process	Do the CLECs agree to adopt the Proposed Interim CMP CR workflow for	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 3	DECISION: Yes, and to be implemented ASAP.

**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
				Product and Process as the “interim” CMP process for CLEC originated CRs?			
126	Issue	Oct 16 Meeting	Exception Process	What process allows CRs to be submitted less than the agreed upon timeframe for CR presentation at the upcoming CMP meeting? Will the Exception Process accommodate this situation?	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	Language for the Exception Process and/or CR Initiation Process. DECISION: Combined with #215 GAP ANALYSIS: #35
127	Action	Oct 16 Meeting	CR Initiation Form	Allow an entry to provide available timeslots for Clarification Meeting	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Nov 1	COMPLETED: Form has been updated for CLECs to provide available timeslots for the Clarification Meeting.
128	Issue	Oct 16 Meeting	CR Initiation Process	When does a CR become the responsibility of the CMP community vs. the CR originator?	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 16	DECISION: A CR becomes the responsibility of the CMP community when Qwest provides a response to that CR.
129	Action	Oct 16 Meeting	Master Redlined Framework	Mark the framework as “interim draft”	Qwest— Jim Maher	CLOSED Oct 16	COMPLETED: Master Redlined document is now marked “Interim Draft”
130	Issue	Oct 16 Meeting	CR Initiation Process—Product/Process	What is the timeframe when Qwest provides a notice on a CR response and be able to post on the website?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Nov 1	COMPLETED: Language under interim CR Initiation Process
131	Issue	Oct 16 Meeting	Master Redlined Framework	Can the framework include Tables to clarify steps and timeframes for each process such as the BellSouth Change Control framework? 10/16: Sandy Evans will create a Table to seek consensus at the next session.	Sprint— Sandy Evans	CLOSED Nov 29	DECISION: After the Core Team baseline the entire master redline framework, the Team will decide then if tables are needed.
132	Action	Oct 16	12-Month Development	Review the release calendar to insure details are included for Release 9.0 and	Qwest— Mark	CLOSED Nov 29	COMPLETED:

**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
		Meeting	Development View	9.1.	Mark Routh	Nov 29	Release calendar with details on the web site
133	Issue	Oct 16 Meeting	Terms	Define “major” and “point” OSS interface releases. Define “Release”.	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	DECISION: Combined with #245
134	Issue	Oct 16 Meeting	OSS Interface Releases	How many releases will Qwest implement in a calendar year—will it implement no more than 4 major releases? And does this apply to GUI implementation?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Nov 1	COMPLETED: Language under Change to Existing Interfaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application-to-application • GUI <p>GAP ANALYSIS #82, 91</p>
135	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	Issue	What is the process for Qwest-initiated CR that are non-regulatory mandated changes?	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 30	COMPLETED: CR Initiation Process addresses both Qwest and CLEC initiated CRs that are non-regulatory changes. <p>GAP ANALYSIS #27</p>
136	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	Redesign Meeting Minutes	What is the timeframe CMP Redesign meeting minutes?	Core Team	CLOSED Oct 30	DECISION: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For 1-day Sessions: Qwest to provide draft meeting minutes <u>no later than 5 business days</u> for Core Team to review • For 2 or more days Sessions: Qwest to provide draft minutes <u>no later than 7 business days</u> for Core Team review • Participant Feedback: <u>same as above</u> • Qwest to distribute and post <u>Final meeting minutes within 2</u>

**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
							<u>business days</u> after comments are due from participants.
138	Action	Oct 30 Meeting	OBF Language	Verify if OBF intended for maximum number of major releases (e.g., maximum of 4 major releases) per calendar year applies to each OSS, or a total of 4 major releases for all OSSs combined?	ATT— Mitch Menezes	CLOSED Nov 29	Qwest proposes no more than 4 major releases per OSS interface in a calendar year. DECISION: 11/29: Qwest will limit the releases for IMA to 4 major releases per year
139	Action	Oct 30 Meeting	Change to An Existing OSS Interface	Propose language for maximum number of major releases for OSS interfaces, other than IMA.	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Mar 5	01/14: There will be a maximum of four major releases for all OSS interfaces, as well as for IMA. COMPLETED: See Changes to An Existing OSS Interface language GAP ANALYSIS #90
140	Action	Oct 30 Meeting	Note	Reword “note” to accommodate weekends and holidays on all timelines as attachments to the OSS Interface elements. 11/29: Qwest to evaluate if the timelines should be in business days or calendar days.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 5	11/29: Elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to An Existing OSS Interface • Introduction of a New OSS Interface • Retirement of an Existing OSS Interface 01/28: “The events listed above are intended to occur on business days.

**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
							<p>If the date on which any event is scheduled to occur falls on a weekend or holiday, then Qwest and the CLECs may negotiate a revised timeline.”</p> <p>DECISION: Qwest to update timelines with a note as stated above.</p> <p>GAP ANALYSIS #80, 139</p>
141	Action	Oct 30 Meeting	Change to An Existing OSS Interface	10/30: Define what will be included in the Technical Specifications.	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Mar 5	<p>12/11: Qwest is prepared to include the following language in the Master Redlined Framework and close this issue: The technical specifications include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A chapter for each transaction or product which includes a business (OBF forms to use) description, a business model (electronic transactions needed to complete a business function), trading partner access information, mapping examples, data dictionary <p>Appendices may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer Worksheets • IMA Additional Edits (edits from backend OSS systems)

**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
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop Worksheets Change Summary (field by field, release by release changes) • EDI Mapping and Code Conversion Changes (release by release changes) • Facility Based Directory Listings • Generic Order Flow Business Model <p>Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.</p> <p>DECISION: Add language to application-to-application as defined above to Redline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to An Existing OSS • Introduction of An OSS <p>Also, see generic definition in TERMS.</p> <p>GAP ANALYSIS #81</p>
142	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	Change to An Existing OSS Interface	Does the team agree that the CR Initiation Process and Prioritization Process have taken place before a change is implemented according to the Changes to an Existing OSS Interface Process?	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	DECISION: Yes

**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
				12-11-01 Clarify in the Master Redline that CRs precede any systems changes within the scope of CMP (exceptions?, production support?) (AT&T item # 14)			DECISION: Yes – See Master Redline Section 3.1 paragraph 3 – AT&T Comments accepted.
143	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	EDI Implem. Guideline	Is the EDI Implementation Guideline under the scope of CMP? 2/6: Does Scope include documentation?	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 5	10/31: The EDI Implementation Guideline will follow the CMP guidelines and timeframes. See Master Redline Section 1.0 COMPLETED: See Scope language GAP ANALYSIS #117, 142
144	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	Change to An Existing OSS Interface	Provide language to address the earliest conversion time to the newly IMA-EDI release is the weekend after the Release Production Date.	Jeff Thompson/ Mitch Menezes/ Beth Woodcock	CLOSED Oct 30	COMPLETED: Language under Changes to An Existing OSS Interface
145	Issue Action	Oct 30 Meeting	OSS Interface CR Initiation Level of Effort	CLEC comments and Qwest responses should be communicated to CLECs. Create a method to communicate via web site.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 5	COMPLETED: Comments and Response function provided. GAP ANALYSIS: #45
146	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	OSS Interface CR Initiation	What are the criteria used to determine 'level of effort' (i.e., S, M, L, XL) for a release?	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Mar 5	12/13: Language included in Master Redline.

**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
							<p>01/14: The CLECs requested that Qwest no longer use a standard set of T-shirt size estimates. Instead, Qwest will give Level of Effort estimates via an estimate of the number of hours necessary to complete each CR for CRs generated after 01/01/02. The Core Team must review the Master Redline to find, and change, all references to T-shirt sizing. COMPLETED: Qwest provides capacity and ranges of hours for each CR as demonstrated with IMA 10.0 and 11.0—see language GAP ANALYSIS #123</p>
147	Issue	Oct 30 Meeting	OSS Interface CR Initiation	Develop narrative to reflect actual timeline to Qwest proposed Candidate List process.	Qwest—Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Oct 30	COMPLETED: Language: OSS Interface CR Initiation Process
150	Issue	Oct 31 Meeting	Prioritization	Is prioritization on a per OSS interface basis?	Qwest—Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Feb 7	11/13: Prioritization of a CR is on a per OSS interface basis.
151	Issue	Oct 31 Meeting	Redesign Core Team Expectations/ Respons.	Define level of participation for the CMP Redesign effort.	Core Team Subcommittee	CLOSED Mar 18	<p>Subcommittee: Leilani Hines, Sharon Van Meter, Terry Wicks 11/9: Proposed language posted on 11/9. Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.</p>

**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
							COMPLETED: See Core Team Expectations document on CMP Redesign web site.
154	Action	Oct 31 Meeting	Qwest Considers CLEC Comments in Final Notice	Insert language pertaining to Qwest will consider CLEC comments/ concerns into the Final Notice.	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Oct 31	COMPLETED: Language: Introduction of a New OSS Interface.
155	Action	Oct 31 Meeting	Reformat Proposed Language	Reformat the Retirement of an OSS Interface to separate GUI language from application-to-application.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Nov 1	COMPLETED; Language: reformatted Retirement of an OSS Interface. GAP ANALYSIS #81
157	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting	Same Time Availability of Comparable Functionality for IMA EDI and GUI	Develop language to insure comparable functionality for IMA EDI users are available at the same time as IMA GUI users.	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Nov 1	COMPLETED: Language: Change to An Existing OSS Interface. GAP ANALYSIS #117
159	Action	Nov 1 Meeting	New OSS Interface	Add language: With a new OSS interface, Qwest and CLECs may define the scope of functionality introduced as part of that interface.”	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Nov 1	COMPLETED: Language: Introduction of A New OSS Interface
160	Action	Nov 1 Meeting	OSS Interface CR Initiation Process	Add picture or listings of timeline milestones.	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Nov 1	COMPLETED: Language: OSS Interface CR Initiation Process
161	Action	Nov 1 Meeting	Proposed Language Documents	Provide Core Team members and participants with the redlined proposed language documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New OSS Interface and OSS Interface CR Initiation: Re-do timelines to align with narrative; send redlined to team (Maher by 	Qwest— Jim Maher and Core Team	CLOSED Nov 7	COMPLETED: Documents are posted on the 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
				<p>Nov 2); team to review and provide comments (by Wed, Nov 7); insert language into the Master Redlined Framework with CLEC comments (for next meeting distribution); modify Qwest internal M&P (Schultz)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retirement of OSS Interfaces: send redlined to team (Maher by Nov 2); insert language into the Master Redlined Framework with CLEC comments (for next meeting distribution); modify Qwest internal M&P (Schultz) 			
162	Action	Nov 1 Meeting	Terms	11/1: Define "CLEC", "Qwest" and "sub-systems"	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	<p>11/30: See Qwest Proposed TERMS Language - 11-30-01 Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item.</p> <p>DECISION: Combined with #245</p>
164	Action	Nov 1 Meeting	CR Initiation Form	Update CR Form: Change "submitted by" and "submitter" to "originator" and "originated by" respectively.	Qwest— MarkRouth	CLOSED Nov 13	COMPLETED: CR Form has been updated and will be presented at the general CMP meetings on 11/14 and 11/15.
165	Action	Nov 1 Meeting	CR Initiation Form	List out ancillary products and correct "operations" to "Operator Services." Also, remove INP.	Qwest— Matt Rossi	CLOSED Nov 13	COMPLETED: CR Form has been updated and will be presented at the general CMP meetings on 11/14 and 11/15.
166	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting	Source Information for Regulatory Mandate CRs	Qwest needs to provide the source with timeline (e.g., effective date and implementation date) for Regulatory changes.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Nov 1	DECISION: Qwest will provide source information for Regulatory types of changes

**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
			Mandate CRs				changes.
167	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting	Prioritization for Regulatory Change	Can Qwest revisit its position on not including Regulatory mandated changes in the Prioritization Process? CLECs understand that Qwest still opt to meet the timeline for compliance.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 5	Discussion held on 11/13, but Qwest needs more time to consider CLECs comments. To be re-addressed at the next session. COMPLETED: Parties agreed on concept; see language under Prioritization—Regulatory Change
168	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting	Prioritization for Industry Guideline Change	Will Qwest change its position to allow Industry Guideline changes to be prioritized through the Prioritization Process. If so, provide language to include Industry Guideline changes as part of the Prioritization Process. Suggested language: Qwest needs to be able to meet timelines where dates are mandated at industry bodies.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 5	Discussion held on 11/13, but Qwest needs more time to consider CLECs comments. To be re-addressed at the next session. COMPLETED: See Prioritization—Industry Guideline Changes
170	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting	CLEC-Initiated PID Change	Will Qwest consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a performance improvement or PIDs subject to the PAP as a Regulatory change? • a CLEC-initiated performance improvement change not subject to PAP as a Regulatory change? 	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 5	12/12: Including closed CMP CR 5582099/AI 121201-2. 3/5 DECISION: 1. Yes 2. Yes
171	Issue	Nov 1 Meeting Nov 28 Meeting	IMA 10.0 Changes	What is the rationale for six (6) IMA 10.0 changes to be treated as Regulatory changes? <hr/> Provide the details for CRs for the 5 remaining “regulatory” CRs on the IMA 10.0 list. Include supporting	Qwest— Mark Routh & Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Feb 5	11/19 meeting to discuss rationale. Qwest to email material and post on the web site by 11/14. 11/30: Qwest to provide details on the CRs.

**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
				documentation (site the FCC order).			COMPLETED: Already addressed in CMP Systems Meeting
174	Action	Nov 1 Meeting	Prioritization Documents	Attach the latest Ranking Form, sample of a Release Candidate List and compilation/tabulation form to the Prioritization section of the master redline.	Qwest— Mark Routh	CLOSED Mar 5	See Qwest Proposed Prioritization Language – Revise 12-01-01, Appendices A, B, and C DECISION: Close item; use IMA 11.0 documents as appendices.
175	Action	Oct 31 Meeting	Core Team Membership	Contact those CLECs that are now dropped as a Core Team member, but may re-active their membership status.	Judy Lee	CLOSED Jan 24	10/31: Rhythms and Scindo will no longer participate. 11/6: Emailed Electric Lightwave, Integra, McLeodUSA, Premier and XO. Contact information not available for Level 3. Integra wants to be a member; McLeod will no longer participate; Premier will continue as a participant. 12/13: XO Communications will not participate with redesign. Sprint has withdrawn from the core team per the email from Sandy Evans.
176	Action	Nov 13 Meeting	OSS Elements	Review and compare CMP red lined document to all other related documents (i.e. 18 point, OBF 2233, open issues log, CLEC issues etc.) to ensure completeness of the proposed Qwest CMP Process and make any changes that may be necessary. Identify additional for OSS Interface, Product/Process and overall elements.	Core Team	CLOSED Jan 18	<u>By Jan 11 Noon Mountain time:</u> Every Core Team member and participant to provide results of review and compare document to Jim Maher. <u>By Jan 18:</u> Jim Maher to send a compilation matrix with CLEC-Qwest-Lee input to the Core Team.

**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
							Individual Team documents will also be shared with the team. COMPLETED: A combined Gap Analysis along with individual submissions were included in the January Redesign distribution package.
178	Action	Nov 13 Meeting	CMP Implem	Clarify what has been agreed upon for the implementation of an interim process.	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	DECISION: Close item.
181	Issue	Nov 13 Meeting	OSS CR Prioritization Regulatory Changes	Qwest to revisit language for the definition of a Regulatory change, and the proposed prioritization process as it relates to these. Qwest asks CLECs to draft proposed language for Regulatory Changes as it is written in the Red lined document to include PID/PAP scenarios. 11/13: Qwest to consider the position of CLECs on the need to prioritize Regulatory CRs and provide its final position at the next session.	Qwest	CLOSED Mar 5	Prioritize all (excludes production support), provide for agreed upon mandatory/industry dates, allow exception, escalation and dispute resolution procedures to be invoked as necessary. (CLEC request) CLECs agree with language for regulatory changes as it is written in the red lined document Prioritization section has to include criteria around how to rank CRs. COMPLETED: Agree in concept; see Prioritization language—Regulatory Changes GAP ANALYSIS #117, 119
182	Action	Nov 13 Meeting	Terms	Define migration testing and new release testing (Initial Implementation Testing),	Qwest—Jeff	CLOSED Mar 5	11/30: See Qwest Proposed TERMS

**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
				and Regression Testing, Controlled Production Testing, Interoperability Testing, SATE in the “terms” section of the red lined document.	Thompson		Language - 11-30-01 DECISION: Combined with #245 GAP ANALYSIS #140
183	Action	Nov 13 Meeting	CMP Gaps	Judy Lee to compare and report any gaps in mapping red-lined document to OBF 2233	Judy Lee	CLOSED Jan 24	Related to #176 Include as part of Core Team matrix for Jan 22-24 session. COMPLETED: Included in Jan 18 Redesign distribution package.
184	Action	Nov 13 Meeting	Issues/Action Items Log	Clarify issues and action items to better capture what the item is. Discussion that does not flush out sufficient detail should be confirmed in the appropriate meeting minutes	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	Began reviewing Issues/Action Items Log for understanding and status. Will continue at next session. COMPLETED
185	Issue	Nov 13 Meeting	Interface Testing	Re-word language to address “Provided a CLEC uses the same connectivity option as it uses in production, the CLEC should, in general, experience response times similar to production.”	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Nov 27	Language added to master redline under Interface Testing.
186	Action	Nov 27 Meeting 12/10 Meeting	Test Scenarios	Are test scenarios provided separately from Tech. Specs or included? (include in Changes to Existing OSS Interfaces section and Application to Application Interface Testing Section) 12/11: Review proposed certification/ re-certification language at the next working session.	Qwest— Teresa Jacobs Andy Crain	CLOSED Feb 6	11/27: Qwest is ready to include the following language in the Master Redlined Framework and to close this item. “A re-certification notification is sent 5 weeks prior to the release, which outlines the transactions and activity types, which have changed

**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
							<p>in the new release and should be retested. This is sent via the normal CMP notification process.” 12/10: Andy Crain to clarify section I.1 (pg 61) of the Red Lined document for the 12/11 meeting. 12/11: Andy Crain provided proposed language for certification/re-certification for the Team to review at the next working session.</p> <p>COMPLETED: 2/6: Team reviewed and inserted language under Interface Testing</p>
188	Action	Nov 27 Meeting	Production Support	Production support notification to include Qwest internal trouble ticket number	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Dec 10	COMPLETED: Language included in Production Support.
189	Action	Nov 27 Meeting	Escalation Process	<p>Draft proposal(s) for an escalation process for technical production problems for both CLECs and Qwest.</p> <p>12/11: The team should determine how to notify the CLECs that a trouble ticket has been escalated.</p>	Qwest— Teresa Jacobs	CLOSED Feb 6	<p>Defining escalation candidates/triggers, criteria, initiators, escalation agents/people who will receive the escalation, escalation contacts, methods, communication feedback & follow up, how to keep lists current, implementation plan. Initial draft planned for 12/17. CLECs will be solicited starting week of 12/17. Will bring language to Jan. redesign meeting.</p> <p>Teresa will call the following for</p>

**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
							input: Leilani Hines –WorldCom Terry Bahner – AT&T Karen Clauson – Eschelon COMPLETED: Team reviewed language. Qwest will present at the 2/21 CMP Systems Meeting for review and acceptance. Technical Escalation Process will be a stand-alone document governed by CMP. GAP ANALYSIS #127, 128
190	Action	Nov 27 Meeting	Severity Level	Determine, when one CLEC is severely impacted, whether this will ever be considered a Severity 1	Qwest— Teresa Jacobs	CLOSED Dec 10	11/28: Ready to close issue with Core Team at next session. COMPLETED: Per Teresa, CLEC will have the ability to open a severity 1 ticket if the description of the CLEC problem matches the definition of a severity 1 ticket.
191	Action	Nov 27 Meeting	IT Help Desk	Validate that the Parent and children trouble tickets are linked and closed.	Qwest— Teresa Jacobs	CLOSED Dec 10	11/28: Ready to close issue with Core Team at next session. COMPLETED: Per Teresa, If a ticket has been opened, and subsequent to the ticket creation, CLECs call in on the same problem, and the Help Desk recognizes that it is the same problem, a new ticket is not created.

**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
							<p>The Help Desk documents each subsequent call in the main ticket.</p> <p>There are instances when a ticket has been opened, but the system problem has not yet been confirmed. If a CLEC calls in on the same problem, but it is not recognized as the same problem, another ticket may be created. At a later time, the system problem may be confirmed. In that case, one of the tickets becomes the main ticket, and the other tickets are linked to the main ticket. When the problem is closed, each ticket must be closed.</p> <p>Language added to section 1.3 of Product Support</p>
192	Action	Nov 27 Meeting	Severity Level 2 Problems	Eschelon wants to check if Qwest needs to continue trouble shooting severity level 2 problems outside of Help Desk hours of operation.	Eschelon— Karen Clauson	CLOSED Dec 10	COMPLETED: Language was added to I.6 of Production Support that illustrates this.
193	Action	Nov 28 Meeting	IMA 10.0 prioritization	Send out an email to the Core Team that discusses the affinity between 25001 and 30623.	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Jan 24	COMPLETED: Jeff Thompson's response was distributed on Wed. December 5, 2001
194	Action	Nov 28 Meeting	IMA 10.0 prioritization	Provide an explanation as well as supporting regulatory document/s as to why the Number Pooling CR #30831 must be done in order for the system to	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Jan 24	COMPLETED: Jeff Thompson's response was distributed on Wed. December 5, 2001

**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
				continue to perform properly.			2001
196	Action	Nov 28 Meeting	Prioritization	Provide a decision on whether to provide copies of documentation regarding prioritization and sizing. 3/6/02: GAP #121--Need visibility into Qwest decisions and criteria used. Also, ATT Priority List #A9.	Qwest-Teresa Jacobs	CLOSED Mar 7	11/28: The CLECs can refer to the "CMP CR Work Flow for OSS Interfaces" document on the CMP Redesign web site (language already incorporated into the Master Redlined framework in narrative format) for an overview of the processes used for releases. 01/14: The CMP Process addresses how work will be prioritized and Qwest, per the Master Redline, will provide sizing for each candidate. 3/6/02: Qwest to provide a walk through of the integration document to the Redesign Team. Core team to review the CR initiation process document for the 3/7/02 discussion. DECISION: No, Qwest will not provide internal documentation.
198	Action	Nov 29 Meeting	Not CLEC Impacting Product/ Process	Send an email to Product and Process employees regarding how to handle changes for the next two weeks.	Qwest—Judy Schultz	CLOSED Dec 11	Judy Schultz to share the memo with the Core Team COMPLETED:

**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
							Refer to CMP Redesign web site document named, "Excerpt from Schultz E-mail – Action Item 198"
199	Action	Nov 29 Meeting	Documentation Version Number	Verify that the version number is on the document. (CLECs want the Version # at the front of the document.)	Qwest— Judy Schultz (Kim K)	CLOSED Jan 22	11/29: Qwest will implement Version numbering on the top of the documents as they are published. Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item. 12/10: The CLECs have asked to keep Action Item open until implemented. DECISION: Close action item. GAP ANALYSIS #142, 146
200	Action	Nov 29 Meeting	Documentation Version Control Tools	Review existing Documentation Version Control tools to see if one will fulfill the CMP needs.	Qwest— Mark Routh	CLOSED Jan 22	COMPLETED: 1/7/02: Qwest has reviewed the current version control process and believes that at this point in time the existing process is adequate to meet the needs of this CMP.
201	Action	Nov 29 Meeting	Documentation	Meet with the Documentation team regarding holding tank and operational versions. Discuss how the history log will work with the holding tank documents.	Qwest— Judy Schultz (Kim K.)	CLOSED Jan 22	COMPLETED: 12/10: Versioning will work according to the following example: 1. Version 1.0 is operational 2. Insignificant change are made and published

**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
							<p>immediately, version is updated</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Version 2.0 is operational 4. CR is created and version 2.0.a is put in the holding tank 5. Version 2.0 is still operational 6. Change is made to correct an error in the document, changes are published immediately and version is updated 7. Version 3.0 is operational 8. It is time to implement the changes in the holding tank (version 2.0.a). The highlighted changes in version 2.0.a are merged with operational version 3.0 and version 4.0 is created 9. Version 4.0 is operational. <p>There will be no history log in the holding tank. The link to the history Log in the downloadable documents will be a dead link.</p>
202	Action	Nov 29 Meeting	Documentation	Update the Documentation History Log	Qwest— Judy Schultz (Kim K.)	CLOSED Jan 22	<p>COMPLETED: 12/17: History log has been updated to reflect the requested changes by the CLECs. It is important to note that since the PCAT does not have section numbers, so this column</p>

**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
							will be blank for PCAT changes. (Refer to sample History Change Log on the CMP Redesign web site.) A History Change Log will be provided for non-FCC technical publications. Qwest follows the FCC guidelines for technical publications, which does not contain a history change log.
203	Action	Nov 29 Meeting	Documentation	With the Historical log there will be a separate log for the PCAT Topical section (drop down list).	Qwest— Judy Schultz (Kim K.)	CLOSED Jan 22	COMPLETED: 12/17: Each topical section of the PCAT is it's own document and thus will have its own history log.
204	Issue	Nov 29 Meeting	Documentation	How will Qwest insure that the dot changes and holding tank changes get updated on the operational version?	Qwest— Judy Schultz (Kim K.)	CLOSED Jan 22	COMPLETED: 12/17: Qwest does not overwrite the HTML version of the PCAT each time a new version is created. When the PCAT requires changes, the HTML version is downloaded into Microsoft Word, the changes are made to the Word document with green highlighting indicating what is being added and what is being deleted. The green highlighting is passed on to the web team. The web team then incorporates the changes highlighted in green into the

**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
							production version of the HTML document. Therefore, if changes are sitting in the holding tank for review and during the holding tank cycle other changes are made to the PCAT, the changes made in the middle will not be over written. Once the changes are made by the web team, the documentation team does a quality check to make sure the changes were incorporated correctly.
205	Action	Dec 10 Meeting	Notification	Capture Event Notification channels for CLECs and Communicate back to the CMP redesign team. Identify document with Event Notification subscription process.	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Feb 6	01/22: Communicator with subscription process posted to Redesign Web site. COMPLETED: Shared with Redesign Team.
206	Action	Dec 10 Meeting	Notification	To insure appropriate Qwest personnel to receive the same event notifications in the same time frames as CLECs	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 6	02/27: COMPLETED Email sent to Service Managers 02/27: To receive e-mail notifications regarding system events, you may subscribe yourself to the notification list via e-mail. To subscribe to the notifications: 1. Send an e-mail to majordomo@qwest.com 2. The required subject line for your e-mail is: Add to wshdnoti mail list

**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
							3. In the text area of the e-mail enter only the following required command: subscribe wshdnoti 4. Send the e-mail to complete the process.
207	Action	Dec 10 Meeting	IT Help Desk	Investigate IT Help Desk VRU to clarify option #3. Verify that Option #1 will prompt an ISC ticket	Qwest— Teresa Jacobs	CLOSED Feb 6	12/21: Terry Bahner-AT&T will provide Qwest with suggestions following the holidays. 01/14: Issue captured in AT&T Gap Analysis DECISION: 2/6: ATT to issue a CR if there is a request for changes to the VRU
208	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	Interface Testing (Non-production problems)	Add language in the Interface Testing section (?) to address the issue about finding a bug in the production code in the test environment: Process for addressing Non-Production support problems that arise in interface testing.	Qwest— Andy Crain	CLOSED Feb 6	Language provided by Andy Crain to Core Team for discussion at next session. 01/21: Production code problems identified in the test environment will be resolved using the process outlined in Section 11.0, Production Support.
209	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	Scheduled OSS Interface Maintenance	Propose language and time frame for scheduled maintenance. Notification and inclusion of known patches or any other known CLEC impacting changes. Whether scheduled maintenance. Included under production support or in	Qwest— Teresa Jacobs (Barb Spence)	CLOSED Feb 6	01/10: See Action Items Language – 01-14-02

**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
				another section in the Red Line Document.			
210	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	Production Support Implementation Date	Determine implementation date for Production Support process.	Qwest— Teresa Jacobs	CLOSED Feb 6	01/14: Qwest will implement all Production Support changes on 02/01/02, except the Technical Escalation Process. The Technical Escalation Process will be implemented two weeks following acceptance at the CMP Monthly Meeting. 2/6: Qwest to present Technical Escalation Process at the 2/21 CMP Systems Meeting for review, discussion and acceptance.
211	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	Production Support	Production support CMP recommendations with a written list of changes from current process. Provide Severity 1 – 4 trouble tickets that are logged in the IT help desk system, and remain unresolved. Examples will be provided reflecting the format of the proposed implementation.	Qwest— Teresa Jacobs	CLOSED Feb 6	Provided in the January Systems CMP distribution package and presented and discussed at the January meeting. CLECs approved an interim test phase. COMPLETED: Open trouble ticket report were sent respective CLEC.
213	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	CR Initiation/ Type of Change	Need a process to debate whether a change fits as a regulatory or industry guideline change. With the information in 3a, CLECs will be informed to have this debate (ATT Issues List).	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 6	COMPLETED: See CR Process language GAP ANALYSIS #25
220	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	CMP Redesign Improvements	Review the CMP redesign improvements matrix from Judy Schultz, to insure that it addressed the WorldCom issue # 4.	Wcom— Liz Balvin	CLOSED Jan 22	COMPLETED: 01/22/02: Discussion held with additional input to Judy Schultz to

**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
							additional input to Judy Schultz to revise matrix with more detailed information.
221	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	PID and PAP Changes Post-271	Send Qwest proposal for PID and PAP changes post 271 approval (9 state filing).	Qwest— Andy Crain	CLOSED Mar 6	DECISION: The ROC process addresses this issue.
223	Action	Dec 11 Meeting	CR Timelines	Develop timelines to illustrate CR process and present Qwest's compliance with these at the CMP Meeting.	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 6	Qwest is prepared to discuss and close this Action Item. COMPLETED Shared with Redesign Team
228	Action	Jan 22 Meeting	Example of Non-FCC Tech Pubs	Provide examples of FCC Tech Pubs vs Non-FCC Tech Pubs.	Qwest— Judy Schultz (Kessler)	CLOSED Feb 5	COMPLETED: Posted on the Redesign website titled "FCC/Non-FCC Tech Pub List – 01-30-02"
232	Action	Jan 23 Meeting	Prioritization— Industry Guidelines	Develop language to address the industry guideline prioritization (above the line and below the line)	Qwest— Judy Schultz/ Teresa Jacobs	CLOSED Mar 6	01/28: This Action Item is addressed in the document which captures Qwest's understanding of the CLEC prioritization proposal. COMPLETED: See Prioritization language
233	Action	Jan 24 Meeting	Impasse Issue— Prioritization	Identify the concept of the Prioritization Process. Upon agreement, Qwest to provide draft language of the Prioritization Process to the CLECs for comments	Qwest— Beth Woodcock	CLOSED Mar 5	1/30: Shared with Redesign Core Team 2/6-7: Proposed language reviewed and discussed at Redesign session. 2/8: Impasse issue included in the CO Report on CMP Issue and the AZ Brief on CMP.

**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
							COMPLETED: See Prioritization language
235	Action	Jan 24 Meeting	Event Notification	Update the language around the information provided in the initial (and subsequent) outage notifications	Qwest— Teresa Jacobs	CLOSED Feb 6	01/28: In order to be proactive, the Help Desk will send initial notifications as quickly as possible – fields on notification forms will be filled out as completely as possible with information available at that time. Thereafter, information related to any remaining open fields will be provided when known. COMPLETED: Language under Production Support
236	Action	Jan 24 Meeting	Web Notice Log	Check with Jarby Blackmun as to the launch date and location of the Notification Web site.	Qwest— Matt White	CLOSED Feb 5	COMPLETED 01/28: Customer Letter Notification page active 1/25/02. (http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/notices/)
237	Action	Feb 5 Meeting	Product/Process	Develop language for “STAY” and parameters for 3 rd party arbitrator	Qwest— Andy Crain	CLOSED Mar 6	Combined with #226
238	Action	Feb 5 Meeting	Documentation	Review Documentation “Holding Tank”	Qwest— Kessler	CLOSED Mar 6	Combined with #229
241	Action	Feb 6 Meeting	Interface Testing	Insure language CLECs testing the Service Bureau configurations is incorporated in the Interface Testing document.	Qwest— Jeff Thompson	CLOSED Feb 6	COMPLETED: Language under Interface Testing
242	Action	Feb 6 Meeting	Escalation Process for Tech Issues	Determine how CLECs will provide contact lists for technical escalations	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 6	COMPLETED: Provided input to Qwest at the 2/21

**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
							CMP Systems meeting when Qwest presents the proposal to CMP team.
244	Action	Feb 7 Meeting	SCRP	CLECs to send written comments in advance to Jim Maher	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 6	2/14 COMPLETED: ATT provided comments.
246	Action	Feb 7 Meeting	CICMP Docs	Archive the old CICMP document and post the current "accepted" CMP doc. Add a link to Direct to CICMP Process document, if necessary	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 6	2/8: Posted on CMP website Qwest is prepared to discuss and close action item. 3/6/02: Qwest completed this over CLEC objection.
247	Action	Feb 7 Meeting	Red Line Document	Put "Clean" copy of the current Red Line doc on the web with clarification statement	Qwest— Judy Schultz	CLOSED Mar 6	2/8: Posted on CMP website Qwest is prepared to discuss and close action item. 3/6/02: Qwest completed this over CLEC objection.
248	Action	Feb 7 Meeting	Terms	2/7: Define 'eligible change request'	Core Team	CLOSED Mar 5	DECISION: Combined with #245

**QWEST-PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR QWEST INITIATED PRODUCT/PROCESS CHANGES
– Revised 03-19-02**

[March 19, 2002, CMP Redesign: Following is a process Qwest will implement as Qwest and CLECs further evaluate and modify it. Further action will be taken by the CMP Redesign team as follows. CLECs and Qwest will review product/process notices issued over the last few months in order to make the list of categories in each “Level” more exhaustive. This initial effort should be completed by April 16, 2002. After this review, CLECs and Qwest will baseline this process, add it to the Interim draft master redline document and implement it as modified.]

The following defines four levels of Qwest-initiated product/process changes and the process by which Qwest will initiate and implement these changes. None of the following shall be construed to supersede timelines or provisions mandated by federal or state regulatory authorities, **certain CLEC facing websites (e.g. ICONN and Network Disclosures)** or individual interconnection agreements. The lists provided below are exhaustive/ finite, but may be modified by agreement of the parties [**Discuss how the levels will be modified long term**]. Qwest will utilize these lists when determining the disposition (e.g. level 1–4) to which new changes should be categorized. **The changes that go through these processes are not changes to systems.**

3.1.1 Level 1 changes

Level 1 changes are defined as changes that do not alter CLEC operating procedures or are time critical corrections. Time critical changes may alter CLEC operating procedures, but only if such changes have first been implemented through the appropriate procedure under CMP for such changes. Level 1 changes are effective immediately upon notice. In the event the CLEC believes that its operating procedures are altered by the change, the CLEC will immediately notify the Qwest CMP manager by e-mail. Qwest will promptly respond to the CLEC and work to resolve the issue.

Level 1 change categories are:

- Verbiage clarifications/wordsmithing
- Providing additional information such as:
 - Additional information regarding existing products (e.g. Premium Listing)
 - Documentation concerning existing processes not previously documented (e.g. inside wiring)
 - New feature downloadable within a PCAT for existing feature not previously documented
- Corrections that do not change the initial purpose of a document
- Corrections to synch up documentation with systems capabilities
- Modifications to frequently asked questions
- Re-notifications issued within 6 months after initial notification (notice will include reference to date of initial notification)
- Training schedule changes (note: training schedules are posted quarterly, if a class is cancelled, notification is provided 2 weeks in advance. If a class is added, it is posted as soon as possible)
- Typo corrections, grammar corrections, product branding changes
- Update Invalid Contact Information
 - Update Contacts lists when contact no longer work for Qwest (e.g. Escalation Contacts List)
 - Contact information updates from organizational changes

- URL changes with redirect link

For any change that Qwest considers a Level 1 change that does not specifically fit into one of the categories listed above, Qwest shall issue a Level 3 notification.

Level 1 Process/Deliverables

For Level 1 changes, Qwest will provide a notification to CLECs. Level 1 notifications will state the disposition (e.g. level 1), description of change, changes are effective immediately, that there is no comment cycle and will advise CLECs to contact the CMP Manager immediately if the change alters the CLECs operating procedures and requires Qwest's assistance to resolve. In addition, Qwest will provide the following for PCAT and Non-FCC Technical Publication ("Tech Pub") changes:

- A web notification form that includes an exact cut and paste of the changes highlighted in green (PCAT) or red-lined (Technical Publications). If necessary, additional text above and below the changes will be provided for context.
- A history log that tracks the changes

Note: For typo corrections, grammar corrections, and product branding changes to PCATs and NonFCC Tech Pubs notifications, web change forms will not be provided. The changes will be documented in the history log for the document to which the changes were made.

Level 2 changes

Level 2 changes are defined as 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 2 change categories are:

- Email address changes
-
- TN changes
- FAX TN changes
- Changes to existing Web content
 - Remove data stored under archive links after certain time period
 - Eliminate a re-direct link
 - Add new functionality (e.g. CNLA)
- Re-notifications issued 6 months or more after the initial notification (notice will include reference to date of initial notification)
- Updates (e.g. CLEC Questionnaire)

For any change that Qwest considers a Level 2 change that does not specifically fit into one of the categories listed above, Qwest shall issue a Level 3 notification.

Level 2 Process/Deliverables

For Level 2 changes, Qwest will provide a notice to CLECs. Level 2 notifications will state the disposition (e.g. level 2), description of change, proposed implementation date, and CLEC/Qwest comment cycle timeframes. In addition to the notice, any documentation changes required to PCATs and Non-FCC Tech Pubs (red-line for Tech Pubs and green highlights for PCATs) will be available for review in the Document Review section of the CMP Website (<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/review.html>), commonly known as the holding tank. In the holding tank, a comment button will be available next to the document to allow CLECs to provide comments. For Level 2 changes that do not impact PCATs or NonFCC Tech Pubs, a comments link will be provided within the notification for comments.

Qwest must provide initial notice of Level 2 changes at least 21 calendar days prior to implementation and adhere to the following comment cycle:

- CLECs have 7 calendar days following initial notification of the change to provide written comments on the notice
- Qwest will reply to CLEC comments no later than 7 calendar days following the CLEC cut-off for comments. The Qwest reply will also include confirmation of the implementation date.
- Qwest will implement no sooner than 21 calendar days from the initial notification.

CLECs may provide General comments regarding the change (e.g., clarification, request for modification). Comments must be provided during the comments cycle as outlined for level 2 changes.

For general comments, Qwest will respond to comments and provide a final notice of the change. Additionally, Qwest will provide documentation of proposed changes to Qwest PCATs and NonFCC Tech Pubs available to CLECs and implement the change(s) according to the timeframes put forth above. If there are no CLEC comments, a final notice will not be provided and the changes will be effective according to the date provided in the original notification.

If the CLECs do not accept Qwest's response, any CLEC may elect to escalate or pursue dispute resolution in accordance with the agreed upon CMP Escalation or Dispute Resolution procedures.

Level 3 changes

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. Qwest will provide initial notice of Level 3 changes at least 31 calendar days prior to implementation.

Level 3 change categories are:

- Changes to whether fields are required
 - Use of manual handling field during manual process
- NC/NCI code changes

- Product enhancements (excluding resale) that do not drive new processes
- Customer-facing Center hour changes
- New manual process
 - Feature verification for large CSRs
 - Working TNs for Resale Centrex
- Modify/change existing manual process
 - Change manual reject reasons
 - Modify manual jeopardy form
- Change CLEC facing process to improve process gaps
 - Service/Account Manager identifies a gap in process based on a CLEC ADHOC inquiry

Level 3 Process/Deliverables

For Level 3 changes, Qwest will provide a notice to CLECs. Level 3 notifications will state the disposition (e.g. level 3), description of change, proposed implementation date, and CLEC/Qwest comment cycle timeframes. For Level 3 notifications that Qwest believes represent a new change category under Level 1 or Level 2, Qwest should propose such new change category in the notice and CLECs and Qwest will discuss the proposal in the next monthly Product & Process CMP meeting. In addition to the notice, any documentation changes required to PCATs and Non-FCC Tech Pubs (red-line for Tech Pubs and green highlights for PCATs) will be available for review in the Document Review section of the CMP Website (<http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/review.html>), commonly known as the holding tank. In the holding tank, a comment button will be available next to the document to allow CLECs to provide written comments. For Level 3 changes that do not impact PCATs or NonFCC Tech pubs, a link will be provided within the notification for comments.

Qwest will provide initial notice of Level 3 changes at least 31 calendar days prior to implementation and adhere to the following comment cycle:

- CLECs have 15 calendar days following initial notification of the change to provide written comments on the notice
- Qwest will reply to CLEC comments no later than 15 calendar days following the CLEC cut-off for comments. The Qwest reply will also include confirmation of the implementation date. In the event there are extenuating circumstances, (e.g. requested change requires significant research, information is required from national standards body or industry (e.g. Telcordia)), Qwest's response will indicate the course of action Qwest is taking and Qwest will provide additional information when available. Once the information is available Qwest will provide a notification and any available updated documentation (e.g. Tech Pubs, PCATs) at least 15 calendar days prior to implementation.
- Qwest will implement no sooner than 15 calendar days after providing the response to CLEC comments. For example, if there are no CLEC comments, Qwest may send out a final notification on the first day following the CLEC cut-off for comments (day 16 after the initial notification). Thus, implementation would be 31 days from the initial notification. However, if Qwest does not respond to the CLEC comments until the 15th day after the CLEC cut-off for comments, the earliest possible implementation date would be 45 calendar days from the initial notification.

CLEC comments must be provided during the comment cycle as outlined for Level 3 changes. Comments may be one of the following:

- General comments regarding the change (e.g., clarification, request for modification)
- Request to change disposition of Level. If the request is for a change to Level 4, the request must include substantive information to warrant a change in disposition (e.g. business need, financial impact).
Request to change disposition to a Level 1 or Level 2 doesn't have to include substantive information to warrant a change.
- Request for postponement of implementation date, or effective date

For general comments, Qwest will respond to comments and provide a final notice of the change. Additionally, Qwest will provide documentation of proposed changes to Qwest PCATs and NonFCC Tech Pubs available to CLECs and implement the change(s) according to the timeframes put forth above.

CLECs and Qwest will discuss requests to change the disposition Level of noticed changes, or to establish new change categories under Levels 1 – 4, at the next monthly Product & Process CMP meeting. In the event that the parties are not able to reach consensus on any such request, CLECs and Qwest will take a vote of the parties in attendance at the meeting. The result will be determined by the majority. If the disposition Level of a change is modified, from the date of the modification forward such change will proceed under the modified Level. When a change to the disposition Level of a particular notice also suggests that a new category of change be established under one of the Levels, a separate vote shall be taken for each.

For a request for postponement, Qwest will follow the procedures as outlined in Section 4 of this document.

If the CLECs do not accept Qwest's response, any CLEC may elect to escalate or pursue dispute resolution in accordance with the agreed upon CMP Escalation or Dispute Resolution procedures.

Level 4 Changes

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 CR process and provide CLEC an opportunity to have input into the development of the change prior to implementation.

Level 4 change categories are:

- New products, features, services (excluding resale)
- Interval changes
 - Increase FOC to 72 hours
 - Changes to Standard Interval Guide (SIG)
 - Change a wire center's status of MSA/ nonMSA or Zone 1 or 2 distinction resulting in a change to the M&R and Provisioning interval

- Change to a pre-order step
 - Need to populate appointment scheduler
 - Check facility availability
- New processes related to product enhancements
 - Add Shared Distribution Loop as an additional sub-loop element
 - Extension tech on UBL
 - New features with new processes
- New PCAT for new processes

Level 4 Process/Deliverables

Qwest will submit a completed Change Request no later than 14 calendar days prior to the CMP Product and Process Monthly Meeting. At a minimum, each Change Request will include the following information:

- A description of the proposed change
- A proposed implementation date (if known)
- Indication of the reason for change (e.g., regulatory mandate)
- Basis for disposition of level 4

Within two (2) business days from receipt of the CR:

- The Qwest CMP manager assigns a CR Number and logs the CR into the CMP Database.
- The Qwest CMP Manager forwards the CR to the CMP Group Manager,
- The Qwest CMP manager sends acknowledgment of receipt to the CR submitter and updates the CMP Database.

Within two (2) business days after acknowledgement,

- The Qwest CMP Manager posts the complete CR to the CMP Web site
- The CMP Group Manager assigns a Change Request Project Manager (CRPM) and identifies the appropriate Director responsible for the CR
- The CRPM identifies the CR subject matter expert (SME) and the SME's Director.
- The CRPM will provide a copy of the detailed CR report to the CR originator which includes the following information:
 - Description of CR
 - Assigned CRPM
 - Assigned CR number
 - Designated Qwest SMES and associated director(s)

Qwest will present the Change Request at the monthly Product and Process CMP meeting. The purpose of the presentation will be to:

- Clarify the proposal with the CLECs
- Confirm the disposition (e.g., level 4) of the Change (see below). If during the CMP meeting CLECs agree to change the disposition, than the type of change being made will be added to the list for the disposition to which it is changed.

- Propose suggested input approach (e.g., a 2 hour meeting, 4 meetings over a two week period, etc.), and obtain consensus for input approach.
- Confirm deadline, if change is mandated
- Provide proposed implementation date, if applicable

At the monthly CMP meeting, the parties will discuss whether to treat the Change Request as a Level 4 change. If the parties agree, the Change Request will be reclassified as a Level 1, 2 or 3 change, and the change will follow the process set forth above for Level 1, 2, or 3 changes, as applicable. If the parties do not agree to reclassify the Change Request as a Level 1, 2 or 3 change, the following process will apply:

- The parties will develop a process for Qwest to obtain CLEC input into the proposed change. Examples of processes for input include, but are not limited to, one-day conferences, multi-day conferences, or written comment cycles.
- After completion of the input cycle, as defined during the CMP meeting, Qwest will modify the CR, if necessary, and design the solution considering all CLEC input.
- For Level 4 changes, when the solution is designed and all documentation is available for review, a notice of the planned change is provided to the CLECs. This notice will be provided at least 31 calendar days prior to implementation. The notice will contain reference to the original CR, proposed implementation date, and the CLEC/Qwest comment cycle. In addition, any documentation changes required to PCATs and Non-FCC Tech Pubs will be available for review in the holding tank (red-line for Tech Pubs and Red-line for Tech Pubs) with a Comment button available to provide written comments. For Level 4 changes that do not impact PCATs or NonFCC Tech Pubs, a comments link will be provided within the notification.
- CLECs have 15 calendar days following notification of the planned change to provide written comments on the notice
- Qwest will reply to CLEC comments no later than 15 calendar days following the CLEC cut-off for comments. The Qwest reply will also include confirmation of the implementation date. In the event there are extenuating circumstances, (e.g. requested change requires significant research, information is required from national standards body or industry (e.g. Telcordia)), Qwest's response will indicate the course of action Qwest is taking and Qwest will provide additional information when available. Once the information is available Qwest will provide a notification and any available updated documentation (e.g. Tech Pubs, PCATs) at least 15 calendar days prior to implementation.
- Qwest will implement no sooner than 15 calendar days after providing the response to CLEC comments. For example, if there are no CLEC comments, Qwest may send out a final notification on the first day following the CLEC cut-off for comments (day 16 after the initial notification). Thus, implementation would be 31 days from the initial notification. However, if Qwest does not respond to the CLEC comments until the 15th day after the CLEC cut-off for comments, the earliest possible implementation date would be 45 calendar days from the initial notification.

CLEC comments must be provided during the comment cycle as outlined for Level 4.

CLEC comments may be one of the following:

- General comments regarding the change (e.g., clarification, request for modification)

- Request for stay or delay implementation, or effective date for which comments are being provided.

For general comments, Qwest will respond to comments and provide a final notice of the change. Additionally, Qwest will provide documentation of proposed changes to Qwest PCATs and NonFCC Tech Pubs available to CLECs and implement the change(s) according to the timeframes put forth above.

For a request to stay or delay, Qwest will follow the procedures as outlined in Section 4 of this document.

If the CLECs do not accept Qwest's response, any CLEC may elect to escalate the CR or pursue dispute resolution in accordance with the agreed upon CMP Escalation or Dispute Resolution procedures.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
 Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

UPCOMING WORKING SESSIONS

Dates/Time	Location	Element
<p>DATE: Tue, Apr 2, Wed, Apr 3 and Thurs, Apr 4 TIME: Noon-6 PM MT on Tue 9 AM-5 PM MT on Wed, Thurs</p> <p>Dial-In Number: 877.550.8686 Conference ID: 2213337</p>	<p>1801 California Street 13th Floor, Room 2 Denver, CO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and baseline language for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qwest-initiated Product/Process Change Process—review categories for Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 • Postponement of Implementation for disputed Product/Process issues • Method of Implementation for Regulatory Changes • OSS Interface CR Process • SCRP • Discuss and agree on concepts for issues categorized as 0's
<p>DATE: Tue, Apr 16 TIME: Noon-6 pm MT</p> <p>Dial-In Number: 877.550.8686 Conference ID: 2213337</p>	<p>1801 California Street 13th Floor, Room 1 Denver, CO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (to be determined)
<p>DATE: Wed, May 1 and Thurs, May 2 TIME: Noon-6 pm MT on Wed 9 AM-5 PM MT on Thurs</p> <p>Dial-In Number: 877.550.8686 Conference ID: 2213337</p>	<p>(to be determined)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (to be determined)
<p>DATE: Mon, May 13 and Tues, May 14 TIME: Noon-6 pm MT on Mon 9 AM-5 PM MT on Tues</p>	<p>(to be determined)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (to be determined)

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Dial-In Number: 877.550.8686 Conference ID: 2213337		

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
 Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

UPCOMING WORKING SESSIONS

Dates/Time	Location	Element
<p>DATE: Wed, June 5 and Thurs, June 6 TIME: Noon-6 pm MT on Wed 9 AM-5 PM MT on Thurs</p> <p>Dial-In Number: 877.550.8686 Conference ID: 2213337</p>	<p>(to be determined)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (to be determined)
<p>DATE: Mon, June 17 and Tues, June 18 TIME: Noon-6 pm MT on Mon 9 AM-5 PM MT on Tues</p> <p>Dial-In Number: 877.550.8686 Conference ID: 2213337</p>	<p>(to be determined)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (to be determined)

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
 Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

WORKING SESSIONS ALREADY HELD

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Thursday, July 11—COMPLETED	1801 California Street, Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kickoff
Thursday, July 19—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Scope • Administration—Managing the Change Management Process
Tuesday, August 7 and Wednesday, August 8—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 – 17 th Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Change)—to be continued • Prioritization—re-scheduled • Exception Process (added by Qwest after 7/19 meeting)—re-scheduled
Wednesday, Sep 5 and Thursday, Sep 6—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim Exception Process • Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of Change)—re-scheduled • Prioritization—re-scheduled • Exception Process—re-scheduled
Tuesday, Sep 18 and Thursday, Sep 20—COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Escalation and Dispute Resolution Process • Re-visit Introduction and Scope (continuing on Oct 2) • Managed Changes—Existing (including Types of

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
 Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

Dates/Time	Location	Element
		Change)—to be continued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release Requirements (e.g., Initial, Walk-through, Comment Cycle, Final, Release Testing)—re-scheduled due to agenda changes • Prioritization—re-scheduled due to agenda changes • Exception Process—re-scheduled due to agenda changes

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
 Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

WORKING SESSIONS ALREADY HELD (continued)

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Tuesday, Oct 2 and Wednesday, Oct 3— COMPLETED	200 South 5th Street, 1 st Floor, Multi-purpose Room, Minneapolis, Minnesota and 1801 California Street 23 rd Floor, Executive Conf Rm. Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qwest's 271 Status Report to CO PUC • Introduction and Scope • Change Request Initiation (continue on Oct 16) • Changes to an Existing Interface (rescheduled)
Tuesday, Oct 16— COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change Request Initiation (CLEC and Qwest) • Changes to an Existing Interface (to be continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Application-to-Application – Graphical User Interface • Prioritization of OSS Change Requests— rescheduled
Tuesday, Oct 30, Wednesday, Oct 31, and Thursday, Nov 1— COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSS Interface Change Request Initiation • Changes to an Existing Interface and Requirements Review (continue) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Application-to-Application – Graphical User Interface • Prioritization of OSS Change Requests (to be continued) • Introduction of a New Interface • Retirement of an Existing Interface • Interface Testing (rescheduled) • Production Support (rescheduled) • Training (rescheduled) • Re-visit the CMP Web Site section (rescheduled) • Managing the CMP (rescheduled) • Determine elements for Product and Process CMP

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

Dates/Time	Location	Element
		discussions (future sessions)—rescheduled

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
 Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

WORKING SESSIONS ALREADY HELD (continued)

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Tuesday, Nov 13— COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritization of OSS Change Requests (Regulatory and Industry Guideline Changes)—to continue • Interface Testing—to continue • Production Support--rescheduled • Re-visit Master Redlined Framework sections for outstanding action items (i.e., Proprietary Process, Good Faith, CMP Web Site) –rescheduled • Determine elements for Product and Process CMP discussions (future sessions)—rescheduled
Tuesday, Nov 27, Wednesday, Nov 28, and Thursday, Nov 29— COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritization of OSS Change Requests (Regulatory and Industry Guideline Changes)—to continue • Interface Testing • Production Support—to continue • Re-visit Master Redlined Framework sections for outstanding action items (i.e., Good Faith, CMP Web Site)—ongoing • Re-visit Qwest-initiated CR Process—to continue • Proprietary Process (CR and Comments/Questions)—to continue • Review Not CLEC Impacting Definitions—to continue • Review Issues/Action Items Log, ATT Issues, WCOM Issues and others as presented—rescheduled • Determine elements for Product and Process CMP discussions (future sessions)
Monday, Dec 10 and	1801 California Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production Support

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Tuesday, Dec 11—COMPLETED	Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Interface Testing—to be continued• Review ATT and WCom Issues Lists

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

**CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS**

Attachment 6

Revised—March 19, 2002

WORKING SESSIONS ALREADY HELD (continued)

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Tuesday, Jan 22, Wednesday, Jan 23, and Thursday, Jan 24— COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and develop guidelines for “What is not CLEC-impacting” for Product/Process—to be continued • Read-out on Interim Product/Process Change Process Implementation • Review History Change Log • Prioritization—to be continued • Review and discuss Core Team Gap Analyses to determine future session topics—to be continued • Issues/Action Items Log
Tuesday, Feb 5, Wednesday, Feb 6, and Thursday, Feb 7— COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and discuss proposed language on the status of a Qwest-initiated Product/Process change when the escalation or dispute process has been invoked—to be continued • Gap/Issues discussion and closure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prioritization—to be continued – Interface Testing – Production Support – Scheduled Maintenance for OSS Interface – Technical Escalation Process
Tuesday, Feb 19— COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap/Issues discussion and closure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Regulatory Change – Prioritization (to be continued) – SCRP (to be continued) – OSS Interface CR Initiation Process (to be continued)
Tuesday, Mar 5, Wednesday, Mar 6, and Thursday, Mar 7— COMPLETED	1801 California Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap/Issues discussion and disposition • Consensus on Concepts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prioritization

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

CLEC-Qwest Change Management Process Re-design
SCHEDULE OF WORKING SESSIONS
 Revised—March 19, 2002

Attachment 6

Dates/Time	Location	Element
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – SCRP – OSS Interface CR Initiation Process – Reasons to Deny a CR – Implementation Suspension during a dispute for Product/Process

WORKING SESSIONS ALREADY HELD (continued)

Dates/Time	Location	Element
Monday, Mar 18 and Tuesday, Mar 19— COMPLETED	1005 17 th Street Denver, CO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and agree on concepts for remaining ATT Priority List items identified as longer discussion required and potential impasse issues (“1’s”) • Discuss and agree on language for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qwest-initiated Product/Process Change Process • Discuss and agree on categories for Covad and WCom list of issues

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. A half hour towards the end of each meeting will be dedicated to the CLEC community to address their issues, if needed.

Attachment 7

Ranking of ATT Priority List Items Identified as 0's - 03-18-02

Concept Agreed to?	Issue	Allegiance	AT&T	Covad	Eschelon	Qwest	WorldCom	Total
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)							0
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.)							
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							0
V.b.	Defined Terms used in the Redlined Draft CMP Document must be concluded. (CMP Issues Log ##106, 133, 141, 162, 182 & 248.)							0
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?							0
V.f.	SGAT Section 12.2.6. (CMP Gap Analysis ## 148 & Clarification of Scope of Issue. In its List, AT&T							0
Covad Issue #1	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 Additional issue. In addition to the issues identified							0
Covad Issue #2	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.e., 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							0
WorldCom	Change Management improvement Document and Process to deploy Qwest CMP improvements / Action							0