

Appendices A, B, and C

Appendices A, B, and C are provided by Hewlett-Packard Consulting.



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2001	The P-CLEC observed a lack of Version and Change Control Processes to support the Interconnection Agreement Negotiation Process.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Implementing an IMA software fix, b.) Updating the IMA Users Guide, c.) Updating the EDI Introduction to include BAN format rules by region.	HP verified the updates. HP closed the Observation and reissued as Exception 2001.
OBS 2002	Qwest appears to have additional USOC/FID information available that is not included on the wholesale website or in the New Customer Questionnaire.	Qwest provided the CLEC community with updated information regarding the use and availability of USOC/FID information. In addition, Qwest addressed the consistency of information across all vehicles.	HP acknowledged receipt of the information. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2003	The IMA Training Class is insufficient to meet the needs of CLECs	Qwest revised its existing classes and added a hands-on course.	HP re-evaluated the courses and found them satisfactory. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2004	The IMA 5.0 Disclosure Documentation business rules processing descriptions are inaccurate.	Qwest made changes to Disclosure Documentation for Release 7.0, including data element names and descriptions for Pre-order data elements used by Qwest but not defined by the OBF - ATIS Ordering billing Forum.	HP verified the updates. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2005	Qwest provided conflicting information concerning availability of the Freeze PIC Indicator (FPI). The P-CLEC found disparity between wholesale and retail FPI service offerings.	Qwest resolutions included updating: a.) IMA EDI Disclosure Document 8.0, b.) GUI I-Chart, c.) Qwest LSOG Order Preparation Guidelines, and d.) EDI Developer Worksheets.	HP verified the updates. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2006	Qwest IMA Listing training contains discrepancies.	Qwest updated and amended its Co-Provider Director Listing User Document. Qwest posted updates its wholesale website. Qwest sent out an industry notification to CLECs.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2007	The P-CLEC experienced fatal errors for IMA "EDI only" on LSR orders sent via EDI. BANs were not valid or available to Qwest's production IMA EDI back office processing environment. Qwest did not indicate that the CLEC must enter the BAN numbers into IMA GUI.	Qwest implemented a system fix to eliminate the requirement for CLECs (both GUI and EDI users) to load BANs. Qwest made updates to both the EDI Implementation Guidelines and Co-Provider System Administration Guide documentation. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the system fix, the updates, and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2008	Qwest did not publish a list of flow-through eligible products.	Qwest made updates to the "LSRs Eligible for Flow-Through" document and post the document to the Qwest website. Qwest distributed the document to the CLECs via the CICMP process.	HP reviewed the document and found it satisfactory. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2009	Qwest IMA Release 5.0 and 6.0 EDI documentation was incorrect.	Qwest determined that its personnel were misinformed when responding to P-CLEC issues. Qwest implemented an internal process to educate employees.	HP retested the impacted transactions successfully. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2010	Documentation available on Qwest's wholesale website did not provide a comprehensive explanation of Qwest product implementation, nor does it provide adequate business rules for building LSR orders.	Qwest made updates to the Interconnection and Resale product information web pages. Qwest provided updated information related to the product description, availability, features, billing procedures, and product implementation, including pre-ordering, ordering, and provisioning procedures. Qwest's web documentation also provides references to appropriate Technical Publications and Qwest Documentation. Qwest sent a notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates. HP verified the notification. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2011	An inconsistency was observed between the Qwest EDI mapping specifications for the EDI 811 document and the actual EDI 811 data being received from Qwest.	Qwest made updates to the EDI BillMate documentation for additional possible locations of the TXI data segment. Qwest sent notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2012	Qwest provided erroneous URLs for obtaining UNE-P and EEL information. Qwest did not send out a corrected Qwest Product announcement to the CLEC community.	Qwest consolidated several web sites to make it easier for CLECs. Qwest implemented changes to its CLEC documentation process. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2013	Qwest does not have consistent guidelines for determining what enhancements constitute categorizing a product as "recertifiable" vs. "new product." Qwest Pre-Order CSR Query underwent major revisions between Release 5.0 and Release 6.0. However, Qwest did not identify the Pre-Order CSR Query transaction as a "new product" in Release 6.0.	Qwest updated the IMA EDI Guidelines document and issued a notification. Qwest classified changes as a "New Product." Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2014	The IMA EDI Release 6.0 documentation does not adequately explain how to use the new EDI Query functionality.	Qwest acknowledged that the Pre-Order CSR Query functionality was not adequately documented with IMA EDI Release 6.0 and made updates to its 8.0 Disclosure documentation and IMA User Guide. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the industry notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2015	There are deficiencies in Qwest's plans to migrate co-provider maintenance and repair functions from IMA GUI Repair and CTAS to the Customer Electronic Maintenance and Repair (CEMR) interface.	Qwest issued CEMR Notification Mailouts to the CLEC community.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation and notification that historical information from CTAS and IMA GUI Repair are accessible via CEMR. HP verified the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2016	The P-CLEC experienced several order processing issues during its IMA EDI 5.0 Certification. Test LSR orders were delayed beyond the defined standard delivery intervals.	The issues were Qwest ISC-training related. Qwest implemented a resource-sharing process to accommodate variations in the ISC workload volumes.	HP accepted Qwest's explanations as satisfactory. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2017	Qwest Reseller documentation stated that Qwest supports the 865 Centrex Work Group Status (WGS) transaction, but the Qwest EDI Team has indicated the functionality is not supported.	Qwest removed the 865 WGS transaction and associated code from the documentation.	HP verified the updates. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2018	Qwest did not provide CLECs with enough notice of IP address changes for Street Address Guides (SAG) and Feature Availability Matrix (FAM) files.	Qwest updated the "Direct Connection" on its website. Qwest updated the Qwest Data Network Information and Requirements document.	HP verified the updates and industry notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2019	Qwest does not provide CLECs with timely responses for EDI certification scenario template development activities.	Qwest resolutions to this Observation included: a.) Addressing the documentation issues raised in this Observation, b.) Updating its product information concerning POTs, UNE, and Directory Listing services, c.) Providing new ordering procedures, product information and documentation on the Qwest website, d.), Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the industry notification. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2020	During Interoperability and Certification Testing, results returned from Qwest via IMA EDI 5.0 did not match P-CLEC expectations based on Qwest documentation. These discrepancies between the expected and actual responses required the P-CLEC to expend additional time and effort in completing its EDI implementation plans. Further, the P-CLEC had to make application and EDI mapping changes to enable it to submit accurate transactions.	Qwest updated its documentation and made code changes to address issues cited in this Observation.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2021	Co-providers must obtain an Ordering and Billing Forum Local Service Ordering Guide (OBF LSOG) data dictionary from a third party to obtain information necessary to complete IMA EDI interface certification. The OBF LSOG data dictionary does not address Qwest-specific data elements, and Qwest does not publish a data dictionary with definitions for these data elements.	Qwest made changes to IMA EDI Release 8.0 Disclosure documentation to clarify the business and EDI coding rules. Qwest removed the field descriptions for the OBF fields noted in this Observation. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notifications. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2022	The P-CLEC experienced Certification testing delays due to a network configuration error and process inadequacies.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Updating the Qwest Data Network Information and Requirements form, b.) Updating the EDI Implementation Guideline in IMA Release 7.0, c.) Migrating all connectivity support to the Wholesale System Help Desk (WSHD) d.) Updating its Wholesale website with WSHD information. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential

For Qwest, Regional Oversight Committee, Hewlett-Packard Consulting, KPMG Consulting, and MTG use only.



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2023	Qwest's IMA EDI Release 5.0 and Release 6.0 Networks Disclosure documents stated that the Qwest Operations Center will modify LSRs to fix non-fatal errors CLECs cannot be certain that Qwest's corrections will not result in the provisioning of an incorrect service or directory listing.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Implementing a process change to eliminate the inconsistency, b.) Updating the IMA EDI Net Disclosure Documentation Releases 7.0 & 8.0, c.) Updating the OSS Interface training, and d.) Updating the IMA Users Guide. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2024	Qwest did not publish to the CLEC community identified defects, implementation dates, or the process for assigning severity codes to change requests identified during EDI Certification testing.	Qwest adopted a "rolling implementation" approach to deploying improvements to its Change Management Process (CMP).	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2025	Qwest's IMA EDI Release 5.0 and 6.0 Business Rules for "confirmation of a Design Layout Record" were inconsistent with other Qwest-provided documentation.	Qwest stated that the IMA EDI Implementation team corrected the information via e-mail. Qwest noted that the Release 6.0 Disclosure Documentation, Appendix B, Developer Worksheets is correct as published, and the DLR Business Rules agree with other IMA resources.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2026	Qwest IMA GUI and EDI interfaces did not consistently provide exact match results when attempting to validate an address by TN.	Qwest asserted the problems were not system-related, but are rather the result of a lack of clarity in documentation and training. Qwest updated the IMA User Guide and Reference Guide with additional language and distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed Observation 2026.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2027	The P-CLEC had never been informed of INFOBUDDY availability.	Qwest stated that although the INFOBUDDY and RPD databases are similar, they are not the same, and as a result, it is not uncommon for Qwest personnel to accidentally refer to the RPD as INFOBUDDY and vice versa. INFOBUDDY is for Qwest internal use only. The RPD is for external use, with access available to users with a digital certificate.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2028	The P-CLEC observed a discrepancy between the Qwest EDI mapping specifications and the actual EDI 811 data being received from Qwest.	Qwest corrected the CRIS EDI 811 transaction specifications in the Billmate billing EDI Customer Guide to accurately reflect the functionality.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP verified the update. HP closed Observation 2028.
OBS 2029	Qwest process documentation for establishing and testing interface connectivity with CLECs via Network Data Mover (NDM) is inadequate.	Qwest explained that, because the P-CLEC was the first co-provider to implement CCUR, Qwest did not identify the requirement until testing began. Qwest had not configured its firewall and routing tables to allow the P-CLEC to transmit data to Qwest. Qwest made the configuration change. Qwest implemented an "OSS Dedicated Access Implementation Checklist" and updated the Data Network Information and Requirements form with references to user ID and password expirations.	HP found Qwest's explanation satisfactory. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential

For Qwest, Regional Oversight Committee, Hewlett-Packard Consulting, KPMG Consulting, and MTG use only.



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2030	The P-CLEC could not submit LSR pre-order information via one electronic interface, then use the response to submit an LSR order through another. Once a co-provider submits an order via a mechanized path, it must submit all transactions for that order via the same OSS gateway.	Qwest acknowledged that its IMA GUI and IMA EDI processors were not integrated. In CMP meetings, a system enhancement change request, CR #445257, addresses the functionality of the interfaces. The CLECs decided that such integration would not provide enough business value.	HP noted that the issue was addressed through Qwest's CMP CR process. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2031	Qwest SMEs did not respond to P-CLEC Maintenance and Repair questions and action items in a timely manner.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Creating a new EB-TA interface, b.) Notifying the CLEC community that in order to establish connectivity to this interface CLECs need to contact their Qwest Service Manager, c.) Clarifying the process for implementing EBTA, and d.) Publishing instructions for EB-TA on Qwest's OSS website.	HP found Qwest's explanation satisfactory. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2032	The P-CLEC experienced multiple Qwest LSR processing errors when requesting a "Convert as Specified with No Directory Listing" for a multi-line retail business account.	Qwest implemented a system fix that would remedy the invoice-over-IMA EDI problem. Qwest issued two internal communicators to educate personnel.	HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2033	The P-CLEC encountered an order error when processing an order for a retail 1-line business customer. The error was caused by a CIC code.	Qwest determined that the EDI translator did not recognize a CIC code of "0000," causing transactions with this CIC code to fail. Qwest resolutions included: implementing a Change Request to correct the condition in IMA version 8.0 and previous versions. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2034	The P-CLEC observed that Qwest rejected all test instances when the P-CLEC placed a leading Zero (0) in the "Circuit ID" field.	Qwest made updates to the CEMR online documentation to clarify the Circuit ID field and its exact formatting requirements.	HP verified the updates to the Qwest website CEMR documentation. HP closed Observation 2034.
OBS 2035	Qwest did not provide adequate notification for a product meeting for Line Sharing, Line Splitting, and Loop Splitting.	A Qwest response to Exception 2003 suggested a re-design of the existing CMP process.	HP closed Observation 2035 in favor of tracking the open issues in Exception 2003.
OBS 2036	Multiple errors in CEMR while attempting to input a trouble report.	Qwest resolutions included implementing: a.) System fixes to actively identify problems as they occur and capture the additional information, b.) Screen Error Retry/Recovery, to reduce the need to re-enter trouble tickets, c.) An Auxiliary Ping and Thread Verification, as an added safeguard to actively monitor network health. Qwest provided notification of the fixes to the CLEC community.	HP verified the system fixes and the updates to the documentation associated with the fixes. HP verified the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2037	Qwest did not published announce that there is a waiting period when attempting to cancel a CEMR report.	Qwest legacy OSS systems require processing time, causing a short delay. Qwest updated its CEMR User Guide, Section 10.6.1 to provide an explanation of the required delay.	HP verified the updates. HP verified the notification of the updates. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2038	When the P-CLEC attempted to cancel a trouble report in CEMR, it received three (3) e-mails in its inbox at the same time, each confirming the cancellation.	Qwest updated its CEMR Users Guide, section 10.6.2, under the Trouble Report Status table to clarify the explanation for three emails. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2039	Qwest's CEMR application windows are not fully documented in existing guidelines.	Qwest explained that the screens (windows) identified as undocumented by the P-CLEC are from the RCE application. Qwest documented the process for updating an existing trouble ticket in the RCE Guide. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2040	The P-CLEC observed cancelled orders appearing on the Qwest Completion Report. Qwest documentation does not reflect that the report will contain order cancellation activity information.	Qwest updated the Completion and Loss Report explanation with the list of Cancelled Order Identifiers (CANP, CANC, or CAN). Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2041	Qwest SMEs did not respond to a P-CLEC question regarding community/city street address abbreviation standards. The P-CLEC could not find adequate documentation regarding the standards.	Qwest revised the mappings document to remove formatting inconsistencies. Qwest distributed industry notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2042	Qwest required the P-CLEC to make repeated efforts in order to gain access to the Qwest Retail Product Site and the product and maintenance and repair databases. Access to necessary Retail Product and Maintenance and Repair databases is a convoluted process requiring several logins, passwords, digital keys, and digital certificates. Qwest does not provide complete and accurate documentation of the requirements for accessing these important databases, and access to important information could be delayed as a co-provider attempts to obtain the necessary access codes.	Qwest made multiple documentation and citation changes.	HP reviewed Qwest's documentation updates related to Digital Certificates and accessing Qwest Retail Product Site. It found the explanations satisfactory and the problem resolved. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2043	The P-CLEC was unable to perform the AVQ by address due to "multiple near matches found."	Observation 2043 describes similar issues as those described in Observation 2026.	HP withdrew Observation 2043, and the issue will be included as an addendum to Observation 2026.
OBS 2044	While attempting to perform a POTS FAQ by AN, the P-CLEC received system errors. Qwest representatives were unable to explain the cause of the errors.	Qwest updated the IMA EDI Disclosure Document, Appendix A - Pre-order Transactions, Ref FAQ32 and FAQ33, Negotiated Business Rules.	HP verified the updates. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2045	The format of Qwest's instructions for manual ordering of Directory Listings is inconsistent with the format of manual ordering instructions for other local service requests.	Qwest revised the documentation on its website regarding Ordering and LSOG forms, including the DL specific form. Qwest distributed an industry notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2046	A comparison of Qwest's website and the ATIS OBF website revealed that there is a significant omission of pertinent information from Qwest's website.	Qwest made changes to its documentation regarding Ordering and LSOG forms, including the LSR specific forms. Qwest distributed an industry notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2047	When obtaining a series of telephone numbers (TN's) for Qwest products using IMA EDI Release 6.0, the P-CLEC transmitted mismatching address data and did not receive fatal error responses.	Qwest's stated that this pre-ordering scenario would not initiate an error response from Qwest.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2048	The P-CLEC received a FOC, SOC, and then received a verbal DL clarification order request from Qwest. It appeared that Qwest requested the P-CLEC to transmit a stand-alone DL after the P-CLEC received an EDI transmission indicating completion of service.	Qwest implemented an expanded system edit to prevent CLECs from ordering two main listings for one main line. Qwest published a notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2049	The P-CLEC sent a SUPP order prior to receiving a FOC. The P-CLEC sent the SUPP to change the due date to one business day beyond the original due date.	Qwest made multiple documentation and citation changes.	HP reviewed Qwest's documentation updates regarding sequencing and found the explanations satisfactory and verified the notifications. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2049	The P-CLEC sent a SUPP order prior to receiving a FOC. The P-CLEC sent the SUPP to change the due date to one business day beyond the original due date.	Qwest made multiple documentation and citation changes.	HP reviewed Qwest's documentation updates regarding sequencing and found the explanations satisfactory and verified the notifications. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2050	Conflicts exist in the instructional information for manually ordering service on Qwest's websites. One website states that the Resale Service Form is required and the other website states that it is not.	Qwest made changes to its documentation and websites regarding Ordering and LSOG forms, including the Resale Service specific form addressed in this Observation. Qwest sent out an industry notification to the CLEC community.	HP reviewed the Qwest documentation and websites, and verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2051	Qwest's website and pre-order transaction responses indicate that additional line tracking, 999AL, is available for Resale orders in Utah. Qwest rejected P-CLEC orders, stating that this feature was not available.	Qwest could not confirm the error relating to the 999AL USOC.	HP closed the Observation, and recommended that the open issues pertaining to the 999AL USOC be tracked in Exception 2007.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2052	Qwest did not provide a response to an UDF IRI within the scheduled timeline provided in the Qwest SIG.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Updating its internal documentation to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the organizations involved with UDF, b.) Updating the Dark Fiber PCAT and UDF forms, c.) Notifying the CLEC community of the change, and d.) Providing a calendar of training it implemented for the Service Delivery Teams.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2053	The P-CLEC experienced LSR order rejections due to Qwest inconsistencies in processing resale orders. The P-CLEC had specific difficulties with using the REMARKS box on the Resale order form.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Updating internal systems to support internal processes, b.) Issuing an internal communicator to the centers and conducting training, c.) Updating external documentation "IMA EDI Release 8.0 Disclosure Document" to reflect that the NAN field was optional.	HP verified the documentation updates and the notifications. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2054	The P-CLEC did not receive 997 Functional Acknowledgements for 1171 EDI pre-order and order related transactions.	Qwest indicated that it did not receive the transaction, which is why the P-CLEC did not receive a 997 functional acknowledgement.	As mutually agreed by the parties, HP recommended that the majority of the transaction-related issues be closed, while one transaction issue was CLOSED - INCONCLUSIVE. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2055	The P-CLEC received information from a Qwest Communicator regarding CEMR Documentation updates, but the Qwest website was not updated.	Qwest recommended a "Reload" to view most current information.	HP verified the updates. HP noted that the updates were made to Qwest's website on September 20, 2001 and not on September 18, 2001, as was stated in the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2056	The P-CLEC did not receive SOCs for UNE and Resale orders.	Qwest resolution not required as the issues were addressed in Exception 2068.	HP addressed this issue in Exception 2068. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2057	The Qwest CTAG User Guide stated that a CLEC can reserve up to five sequential TNs. The P-CLEC was only able to reserve two consecutive numbers.	Qwest updated the CTAG User Guide to describe the possible limitations of TN selection functionality and explain the appropriate entries for the 'Service Category' field. Qwest issued an associated industry notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2058	Qwest did not provide sufficient notification to the CLEC community for CMP meetings.	The CR Clarification meetings are now held with the CLEC that originates a CMP CR only.	HP verified that the CMP change was in meeting minutes. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2059	The P-CLEC received a FOC and SOC for an order, SUPP'd the order via IMA EDI, and Qwest did not process the SUPP.	Qwest indicated that it did not receive the transaction. Qwest maintained that the order was not received.	HP noted that according to its Interactive Agent (IA) logs, the SUPP was received. As mutually agreed by the parties, HP recommended that this transaction be marked as "CLOSED – INCONCLUSIVE." HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2060	Some Qwest error messages are inconsistent and unclear. These error messages show dissimilar word structure that oftentimes fails to address the actual problem.	Qwest provided explanations of the reasons for the error messages. Qwest stated that it did not have documented guidelines or templates specifically for SDC generated error messages, however, the SDCs are coached to be clear and concise in their written response. Qwest indicated multiple possible combinations of errors that can occur; therefore it is not feasible to expect a standard response for each situation. Qwest stated additional coaching would be provided to the SDCs who issued the rejects.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2061	Information found on the Qwest Customer Service Record (CSR) differs from the information found on the P-CLEC's CSR.	HP suggested that it could be a result of test design. Qwest agreed that this error is an anomaly uniquely attributable to the test design. During the test-bed set-up, the P-CLEC should have received the Qwest end user CSR. This would have replicated the actual CLEC experience by ensuring the CLEC had both the SBN and the TN. In a real-world situation, "Both the SBN and the end-user TN are returned to the CLEC as part of the ordering process. The TN and the SBN are also provided to the CLEC on the monthly Line -Sharing service bill."	HP accepted Qwest's explanations. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2062	Qwest does not provide a public level of version control for CEMR GUI, preventing the P-CLEC from coordinating the CEMR application with the CEMR Release Notes and the CEMR User Guide updates.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Adding version information to the CEMR Product Support Screen, b.) Building a process to update this information with every release, c.) Changing the Release Notes and the CEMR User Guide to identify the CEMR version to which the documents apply, d.) Posting a note to the wholesale web site when a release does not require release notes.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2063	Qwest System Event Notifications neglected to provide specific data related to outage date and time. Additionally, the notification failed to list the restored date and time.	Qwest developed a process to ensure that appropriate event notifications are sent to the CLEC community. The notifications now include date, time, and descriptions of the outage event. Qwest issued an associated industry notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the notifications. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2064	The P-CLEC received inconsistent ECCKT IDs on its IMA EDI FOCs.	Qwest implemented a fix with Release 8.01 so that the ECCKT field is populated on the Firm Order confirmation. The fix addressed LSRs received via EDI or GUI. The fix was retrofit to IMA EDI Releases 6.0 and 7.0. Qwest published the AN Matrix.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP verified the updates and the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2065	No chapter in the CTAG User Guide illustrates and explains returning TNs after the TNs are accepted. The return function appears to be available only prior to accepting TNs.	Qwest updated the 8.1 CTAG User's Guide to better clarify the functionality of the CTAG return buttons. Qwest sent notification of the change.	HP verified the updates and industry notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2066	When attempting to create and submit a design trouble report, the P-CLEC discovered inconsistent CEMR edit errors. The CEMR system provides the error message "Invalid Serial Circuit ID Entered" when a blank field is used in the Prefix, Serial, Suffix, CO, and Segment fields.	Qwest concurred that the error message was inconsistent with messages issued for other similar errors. Qwest revised the error message with other similar error conditions and notified the CLEC community of the change.	HP verified the update and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2067	Qwest returned Feature Details formatted so that it makes it difficult for a CLEC to verify the accuracy of the order.	A User Request (UR) and a Change Request (CR) was submitted through the Account Management process to address these issues. These requests will be discussed in the standard CMP meetings conducted by Qwest.	HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2068	Qwest sent the P-CLEC the monthly Directory Listing Reports associated with another co-provider. HPC requested clarification of Qwest's process for distributing listing activity reports, detail for generating, storing and distributing these listing activity reports.	Qwest introduced two changes to its internal processes to ensure correct mailing of directory listings does occur in the further. Qwest coached the Qwest representative responsible for the error.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2069	Qwest documentation has not been updated to reflect the proper forms required for disconnect orders.	Qwest updated the IMA EDI Release 8.0 Disclosure documentation to include the CRS forms for Centrex 21 orders. Additionally, Qwest updated posted Addendum Version 7 of the 8.0 IMA EDI Disclosure Document to its website capturing the change to the POTS resale forms required for IMA Release 6.0 and 7.0 users.	HP verified the updates and industry notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2070	Customer Service Records for suspended accounts do not depict the accounts as being in the "Suspended" status (missing a Suspend USOC).	Qwest concurred with HP that the Customer Service Records did not accurately reflect the state of the accounts. Qwest implemented an Eastern region BOSS system modification. Qwest implemented an IMA system modification that will provide the DENY FID for Eastern region accounts on the CSR. Qwest sent a notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the notification. HP retested and Qwest met the established 95% performance benchmark. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2071	The P-CLEC was unable to locate information about Qwest's plans regarding Qwest system compatibility with upgrades to manufacturers' software applications and operating systems (e.g., Netscape Navigator, Internet Explorer, etc.) that support Digital Certificates.	Qwest stated that all Qwest Wholesale web-enabled CLEC applications are currently supported by the Netscape Navigator 4.51 web browser running on a client workstation with the Windows Operating System 95, 98, or NT 4.0 versions only. Qwest also stated that it expects upgrade initiatives will be driven through the CMP process either by Qwest's business need to adhere to developing industry standards or by CLEC initiated proposals.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2072	A P-CLEC order submitted via EDI 7.0 to "convert, reusing facilities, a 1-line retail DS1 business customer to CLEC UNE DS1 loop without number portability" was rejected with an unclear ISC generated error message.	Qwest stated that the Qwest SDC reviewed the LSR and mistakenly determined that the CLLI code was incorrect for the product ordered. The coaching staff for this typing center was advised to review LSRs for error conditions and the SDC responsible for this error was coached.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation 2072 with note that additional errors would be tracked in Exception 2075.
OBS 2073	Qwest's documentation for "Conversion as Specified to Enhanced Extended Loop (EEL)" is not clear and, in some cases, provides conflicting information.	Qwest made updates to the IMA EDI Release 8.0 Disclosure Documentation and LSOG Documentation to clearly communicate the valid values for product 26 (EEL). Qwest sent a notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2074	The P-CLEC received errors when attempting to submit a DLRQ on a "convert, reusing facilities, a 1-line retail residential customer to CLEC UNE analog loop without number portability" order after it received a FOC.	Qwest stated that the error message was due to a table in a Qwest backend system not containing current information for routing the query. Qwest updated the table and the P-CLEC was notified that the query could be resubmitted. Qwest implemented a system fix to ensure that the DLR query occurs across all tables/regions.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2075	Qwest did not send an invoice for Unbundled Dark Fiber (UDF) to the P-CLEC for an order that Qwest confirmed. HPC requested clarification of Qwest's process for distributing and generating UDF invoices.	Qwest's resolutions included: a.) Modifying the UDF processes, b.) Correcting and sending invoices to the P-CLEC, c.) Making updates to the PCAT, and d.) Retraining Qwest personnel via internal communicator.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation and verified the process updates and revised invoices. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2076	The Qwest Directory Listings manager could not provide information regarding P-CLEC DL orders in a timely manner. The information that was provided was regarded as a "workaround."	Qwest implemented a software fix to remedy the specific issue raised in this Observation.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation that the instructions provided were not a "workaround." HP tracked the results of the system fix in Exception 2086. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2077	The P-CLEC discovered instances in which Qwest did not automatically generate electronic CRIS 811 invoices and delayed responses on these missing bills.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Reconfiguring the ISPF Editor options to ensure extraneous characters are not appended to edited records, b.) Verifying record totals to validate the data sent to the customer matches the original EDI file, c.) Correcting programming logic in CDES, and d.) Coaching the EDI group to ensure CLECs are provided regular and timely status.	HP accepted Qwest's explanations, and verified the updates and notifications. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2078	Qwest's current implementation of RLDQ by Assigned Address functionality does not provide information on Co-provider Unbundled Loop accounts.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Implementing the RLD Assigned by Address Query functionality for unbundled working loops in IMA 9.0, b.) Retrofitting IMA EDI 8.0 with similar functionality, c.) Updating all associated documentation, including the PCAT, d.) Issuing a Release Notification to the CLEC community, and e.) Providing an explanation regarding the transition plan for the Release 7.0 users.	HP verified the system fix, documentation updates, and notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2079	Qwest extended the delivery dates for "Conversion As Is" service despite the fact that the P-CLEC's requested due date is in excess of Qwest's required service interval.	Qwest stated that the orders at issue in this Observation were impacted by an incorrect entry in Qwest's standard interval table for UNE-P conversion as is orders. Qwest corrected the error.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2080	Qwest's SIG documentation provides inconsistent and unclear information pertaining to the hierarchy or applicability of certain business rules.	Qwest made multiple changes to the SIG and commented on the multiple issues raised in this Observation.	HP reviewed Qwest's response. HP and Qwest discussed ongoing issues with the SIG on Observations/Exceptions Focus Calls. HP was ultimately satisfied with the updates to the SIG. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2081	The Qwest produced "In Galley" Report was formatted inconsistently for customer records when compared to previous IN GALLEY Reports. Some records were written in all capital letters; some in mixed characters with both upper case and lower case letters.	Qwest confirmed that there was a formatting issue with bus Verification Proofs (VP). Qwest updated the internal table to resolve the issue. Qwest notified each impacted CLEC informing them about the irregular formatting condition on the Verification Proof reports.	HP verified the receipt on the March VP. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2082	A P-CLEC CSR listed two CLEC Company Codes.	Qwest made the following documentation updates to reflect the proper usage of the AN, Remarks, Manual Handling and ECCKT fields in the LSR and Loop Service Forms for Co-Provider to Co-Provider conversions/migrations of Unbundled Loop orders: a.) IMA EDI 8.0 Addendum 14 Disclosure documentation, b.) IMA EDI 9.0 Addendum 1 Disclosure documentation, c.) LSOG, and d.) Migrations and Conversions Overview PCAT.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2083	The P-CLEC found that the Qwest Loss and Completion report contains incorrect information.	Qwest's research identified an error in the Loss and Completion report. The user name and address for Complex resale products using circuit IDs were pulled from the wrong fields. Qwest corrected this problem and issued notification to the CLEC community. Qwest determined the BN (Bill Name) was being utilized in the Eastern and Western regions rather than the SN (Service Name) for Complex resale products, using Circuit IDs. Qwest implemented a system fix for the Eastern and Western Regions to correct the problem and sent the associated notification.	HP verified the update and retested unsuccessfully. HP verified the update and retested unsuccessfully (one failed instance of four). It was determined that the retest failed due to test bed issues. HP found this explanation satisfactory. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2084	The P-CLEC was unable to locate information in the Qwest Directory Listing User Document regarding the timeframe in which co-providers should expect to receive the Scheduled Monthly Verification Proof Reports.	Qwest's updated the Facility-Based CLECs and Reseller/Unbundled Network CLECs Directory Listing User Document and published the information on the external Qwest website. Qwest sent the notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2085	The P-CLEC's February Verification Proof Report contained both old and new listings information. Discrepancies in Qwest documentation between the text under the Manual Listing Inquiry Request heading and the text under the Verification Proofs heading existed, causing confusion.	Qwest updated the Facility-Based CLECs and Reseller/Unbundled Network CLECs Directory Listing User Document. Qwest modified the DLIS User Document and monthly VP and On-demand VP cover letters and sent notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and associated industry notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2086	Contrary to Qwest documentation, approximately half (2768 of 5601) of the P-CLEC's FOCs contain remarks, requiring co-providers to manually review all FOCs.	Qwest issued an internal communicator reinforcing the appropriate and consistent use of the CFLAG field and associated remarks on FOCs. Center coaches reviewed the CFLAG field as part of the quality review process.	HP found Qwest's explanations satisfactory. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2087	According to the Qwest confirmation report, Qwest cancelled P-CLEC orders due to errors. The orders appeared on Qwest's Verification Proof reports, indicating that they were completed.	Qwest updated the Facility-Based CLECs and Reseller/Unbundled Network CLECs Directory Listing User Document. Qwest sent an industry notification to the CLEC community regarding the updated information.	HP verified the updates and industry notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2088	The P-CLEC did not receive Completion Reports for completed orders. It cannot determine whether the orders would be included on future reports, as Qwest publishes no timeline.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Implementing a fix that added T&F UNE orders to the completion report, b.) Updating its existing PCAT, c.) Posting a new Loss and Completion Job Aid, d.) Distributing notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and the notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2089	Contrary to the Qwest Disclosure Documentation, the P-CLEC received a FOC and a SOC on an order submitted with an incorrect Type of Service (TOS).	Qwest provided information regarding the TOS field and an explanation as to why the order did not reject. The Observation was discussed on a focus call on March 20, 2002.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2090	The P-CLEEC experienced instances where resale orders for 'Conversions As Is' and 'Conversions As Specified' did not flow through the Qwest system.	Qwest provided explanation regarding manual processing and hours of operation.	HP acknowledged Qwest's statements regarding the manual processing. HP verified the IMA GUI hours of operation were changed on the Qwest website in accordance with its response. Qwest issued a release notification to the CLEEC community for the IMA GUI hours of operation. HP found Qwest's explanations satisfactory. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2091	Qwest's Completion Report is formatted inconsistently. Numerous inconsistencies were cited in the Observation.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Providing analysis of the cited inconsistencies, b.) Implementing a system enhancement related to populating the PON field, c.) Posting a new Loss and Completion Job Aid, d.) Updating the PCAT, e.) Presenting its process including planned improvements for free-form PON fields at the CMP forum, f.) Obtaining approval from the co-provider community before implementation.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2092	Directory Listing (DL) orders that had received FOCs were not included on either the "On Demand Verification Proof (VP) Report" or the Monthly VP Reports.	Qwest, KPMG, and HP determined that the orders did not appear on reports due to the nature of the test.	HP accepted the explanation that the structure of the test caused the issue. HP closed the Observation.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

invent

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
OBS 2093	The P-CLEC identified inconsistencies in the formatting of Directory Listings.	Qwest concurred that the business rule regarding LALOC, DL-70 (City Name) is not clear and appears to conflict with the verification proof reports. Qwest corrected the IMA EDI Disclosure 9.0, 8.0 and the DL LSOG on April 12, 2002. Qwest updated the Facility-Based CLECs and Reseller/Unbundled Network CLECs Directory Listing User Document.	HP validated that Qwest did update the Facility-Based CLECs and Reseller/Unbundled Network CLECs Directory Listing User Document. HP closed the Observation contingent upon an opportunity to either a.) Reopen the Observation or b.) Open another Observation or Exception if the Disclosure Documentation update is not reflective of the release notification. HP closed the Observation.
OBS 2094	Qwest issued a FOC and a SOC for an order that contained an incorrect Telephone Number (TN).	Qwest's stated that the LSR did not error with an incorrect TN, and that the SDC making the error was coached.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Observation.
EXC 2001	The P-CLEC received information and documentation from Qwest during the Interconnection Agreement negotiation process that was variously incomplete, misleading, inaccurate, and confusing.	Qwest updated the Wholesale website. The website houses the "Working SGAT/Negotiations Template."	HP verified the updates. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2002	Qwest Post-Order LSR query functionality is not consistent across all LSR statuses. IMA EDI 5.0 and 6.0 do not provide a valid response to an LSR query for a canceled PON.	Qwest modified its IMA GUI and EDI systems to allow ad hoc status queries for cancelled orders.	HP verified the system fix and notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2003	Qwest did not follow its established release notification schedule when implementing IMA releases. Additionally, Qwest did not provide complete and accurate information in its published release notifications to enable co-providers to prepare adequately for certification and implementation of new releases.	Qwest reviewed materials presented to the CMP Redesign team and discussed proposals during meetings.	HP accepted Qwest's explanations. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2004	Qwest did not consistently identify CLEC BANs across billing media. Further, when the P-CLEC discovered the BAN formatting, the Qwest Help Desk was unaware of any published information explaining how to interpret the different BANs, and had to seek information from Qwest Billing SMEs.	Qwest updated the billing summary information on its website.	HP verified that the updates. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2005	Qwest IMA GUI and EDI Release 6.0 Business Rules do not provide sufficient instruction for creating and submitting orders for new "DID In Only Trunk" installations. Additionally, the current DID interface design does not provide Qwest Service Center Representatives enough information to properly provision the Qwest internal service order.	Qwest provided responses clarifying the Remarks field for supplemental information that Qwest requires when processing the order type.	HP accepted the explanations provided in Qwest response. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2006	Qwest Post-Order Status Update did not function according to Qwest documentation in EDI 6.0 and IMA GUI.	Qwest explained that the P-CLEC used obsolete documentation. Qwest removed the 7.0 Version of the IMA User Guide from the website and "retired" the obsolete URL. To improve communication to CLECs, Qwest distributed an internal communicator to the Qwest Help Desk staff on how to describe the causes of these status messages.	HP verified the removal and notification. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2007	P-CLEC experienced LSR order processing errors due to Qwest's failure to load all of the P-CLEC USOCs into its back-end CDDP table.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Implementing a Weekly Rate Change Report, b.) The Qwest account management team providing P-CLEC with a document that showed valid USOCs for the P-CLEC, and c.) Adding verbiage to the USOC/FID finder Web site.	HP retested successfully and verified the update. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2008	Qwest IMA GUI drop-down values and IMA EDI Release 6.0 business rules do not agree where the REQTYP data element for Shared Loop products is described (Product 24).	Qwest updated the IMA User Guide.	HP verified the update. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2009	Qwest IMA EDI 6.0 Disclosure Documentation and web-based product information are inconsistent. Qwest published conflicting business rules for ordering UNE-P POTS services.	Qwest updated the UNE-P POTS information in the Release 7.0 and 8.0 of the Disclosure Documents.	HP verified the updates. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2010	Qwest returned inconsistent FOCs or Rejects on orders. The P-CLEC submitted multiple orders with the same scenario parameters and received FOCs on some orders, while Qwest rejected others.	Qwest stated that the issues were caused by human error. Qwest coached its employees and sent internal communicators.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2011	Qwest's Service Interval Guide does not provide information across all order activities for the listed products and services.	Qwest updated the Service Interval Guide to include information on "Convert as Specified," and sent an associated release notification.	HP verified the update and notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2012	P-CLEC experienced LSR order processing errors in IMA GUI due to USOCs not being recognized as valid or resellable when entering orders.	Qwest updated the Product Catalog, IMA Hands-On Training documentation, and the IMA 7.01 User Guide.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2013	Qwest rejected the P-CLEC's orders for Measured Rate service citing "Service not Available." The discrepancies between Qwest's documentation, resources, forms and the available service on a state-by-state basis made it difficult for the P-CLEC to submit orders in different Qwest Service territories.	Qwest stated that the issues were caused by human error. Therefore, Qwest coached employees and sent internal communicators. Qwest updated the Product Catalog.	HP: a.) Acknowledged Qwest's explanation that the errors were caused by human error, and b.) Verified the documentation update. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2014	Qwest rejected P-CLEC orders for Seasonal Suspend service citing "Service not Available." There is no documentation that states this service is not available in some regions or states.	Qwest resolutions included updating the a.) USOC/Fid Finder tool, b.) The IMA EDI Disclosure Documents, and c.) The Product catalog. Qwest sent associated release notification to the CLEC community.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2015	Qwest incorrectly set the statuses of P-CLEC customers' accounts to "Final," causing the accounts to lose dial tone. The problems occurred due to erroneous processing by the Qwest Billing Order Support System (BOSS).	Qwest made changes to its legacy system.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2016	Due to inability to verify CSRs, P-CLEC cannot process LSRs for existing or prospective customers.	Qwest implemented a system modification and updated the IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation (Releases 6.0, 7.0, and 8.0) and the IMA 8.0 User Guide. Qwest also sent associated release notification.	HP retested successfully and verified the documentation updates. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2017	In some order instances, the P-CLEC received appropriate 997 order acknowledgements; however, the corresponding FOCs were not received.	This Exception was deemed similar to Exception 2030.	HP withdrew Exception 2017.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2018	The interface between Qwest and the P-CLEC failed for extended periods (five hours on May 1, 2001 and one hour and forty minutes on May 7, 2001). The outages prevented the P-CLEC from processing any pre-order transactions or LSR orders during the outage.	Qwest developed e-mail industry notifications for instances of system outage.	HP verified the receipt of such a release notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2019	For LSR orders for Resale products (REQTYP = EB) and Conversion As Is (ACT = W) order activities, the P-CLEC received appropriate 997 Order Acknowledgements and FOCs; however, the corresponding SOC's were not received.	Qwest implemented a system modification and sent a release notification.	HP accepted the explanations provided in Qwest's responses and verified the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2020	While entering trouble reports into the CEMR application, the P-CLEC experienced shortened "time-out" intervals (i.e., shorter than the published interval).	Qwest extended the CEMR timeout period and sent associated release notification. Qwest updated the CEMR User Guide.	HP a.) Accepted the explanations provided in Qwest's responses, b.) Verified the notification, and c.) Verified the updates. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2021	Qwest sent multiple completion responses within a single electronic envelope. The P-CLEC missed SOC's because the SOC's were not in separate files.	Qwest converted from an EDI Open Translator to a GXS translator.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2022	The P-CLEC received EDI IMA Release 6.0 transactions from Qwest outside of the published IMA hours of availability.	Qwest synchronized IMA transmissions with the IMA published operation hours.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2023	The P-CLEC was unable to cancel CEMR trouble tickets.	Qwest updated the CEMR User Guide and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and notification. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2024	Qwest processed only the "disconnect" portion of a "Convert as Specified from Retail to an Unbundled Analog Loop" LSR order, resulting in an interruption of service delivery to a customer for nearly two weeks.	Qwest stated that the issues raised in this Exception were caused by human error. Qwest outlined a new process to streamline its internal processing.	HP a.) Accepted the explanations provided in Qwest's responses, b.) Verified receipt of the notification, and c.) Retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2025	In the CEMR utility, the "Customer Report ID" in the Maintain Function provides incorrect random tracking report information.	Qwest updated the CEMR User Guide to better describe the functionality.	HP verified the updates. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2026	For a P-CLEC order, the P-CLEC sent a total of eight (8) LSRs. Seven (7) of the LSRs rejected. The eighth was cancelled. The P-CLEC received a SOC on version 6 after the cancellation.	Qwest stated that the issues were caused by human error. Qwest resolutions included a.) Conducting internal training, b.) Issuing internal communicators, and c.) Sending release notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified receipt of the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2027	A "Cancel" transaction appeared on a P-CLEC Completion Report after the order received a SOC notice via EDI. The P-CLEC did not submit a cancel transaction.	Qwest stated that the issues raised in this Exception were caused by human error. Qwest provided individual employee training.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2028	Qwest did not provide adequate information for determining accurate technical specifications for Designed Services. NC / NCI / SECNCI documentation is ambiguous.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Updating its LSOG documentation, b.) Updating its Wholesale website, c.) Sending a related industry notification, and d.) Sending internal communicators to reinforce process.	HP verified the documentation updates and receipt of the release notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2029	Qwest's ISC practice for processing orders is inconsistent with the published Qwest IMA EDI 6.0 Disclosure documentation and business rules. When processing orders, the P-CLEC did not receive FOCs, but did receive SOC's.	Qwest converted from an EDI Open Translator to a GXS translator.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2030	When processing orders, the P-CLEC received a FOC, and then received an ISC generated reject (FATAL).	Qwest updated the IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation (Releases 7.0 and 8.0).	HP retested. During the retest, Qwest met the established 95% performance benchmark. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2031	When processing orders, the P-CLEC received multiple FOCs and then received an ISC generated reject (FATAL).	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Updating the IMA EDI 8.0 Disclosure Documentation, b.) Issuing internal communicators, and c.) Retraining employees.	HP retested. During the retest, Qwest met the established 95% performance benchmark. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2032	When processing orders, the P-CLEC received an ISC generated reject (FATAL), did not receive a FOC, but then received a SOC.	Qwest updated its website and issued an internal communicator.	HP verified the update. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2033	When processing orders, the P-CLEC received a FOC, a subsequent ISC generated reject (FATAL), but then received a SOC.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Implementing a system update, b.) Updating the IMA EDI Network Disclosure Documentation (Release 7.0 and 8.0), c.) Issuing internal communicators, and d.) Providing continued reinforcement in employee training.	HP verified the documentation updates and retested. During the retest, Qwest met the established 95% performance benchmark. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2034	When processing orders, the P-CLEC received an ISC generated reject (FATAL), a FOC, and then a SOC.	Qwest updated the IMA EDI Network Disclosure Documentation (Release 7.0 and 8.0), and issued internal communicators.	HP verified the documentation updates and retested. During the retest, Qwest met the established 95% performance benchmark. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2035	When processing orders, the P-CLEC received SU notifications from Qwest indicating that an order completed and had, "Posted to be billed." These notifications were on orders that received an ISC generated FATAL reject or did not receive a SOC.	Qwest updated the IMA EDI Network Disclosure Documentation (Release 7.0 and 8.0), and retrained employees.	HP verified the documentation updates. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2036	When processing orders, the P-CLEC received multiple FOCs. Some orders had Qwest-initiated DDD changes. The P-CLEC did not receive a Jeopardy Notice from Qwest for these orders.	Qwest issued internal communicators and retrained ISC Representatives.	HP retested. During the retest, Qwest met the established 95% performance benchmark. HP closed the Exception
EXC 2037	When processing orders, the P-CLEC received FOCs after the order completed and the SOC generated. Some of the FOCs reflected Qwest initiated account data changes (i.e., telephone number assignment). The transaction history showed that, after the normal notification process, Qwest changed the telephone numbers. The TNs requested were confirmed on the original FOC, and shown as completed on the SOC.	Qwest stated that the issues raised in this Exception were caused by human error. Qwest implements several system enhancements to decrease the chance of human error.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2038	Qwest did not publish adequate instructions for manually ordering RPL. The information on Qwest's website did not appear on the order forms on the Alliance for Telecommunication Industry Solutions (ATIS) website.	Qwest updated its LSOG documentation and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2039	Qwest did not publish adequate instructions for manually ordering DSCR. The information on Qwest website did not appear on the order forms on the Alliance for Telecommunication Industry Solutions (ATIS) website.	Qwest updated its LSOG documentation and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2040	Qwest did not publish adequate instructions for the LS Form. The information on Qwest's website did not appear on the order forms on the Alliance for Telecommunication Industry Solutions (ATIS) website.	Qwest updated its LSOG documentation and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2041	Qwest did not publish instructions for the RS Form. The information on Qwest's website did not appear on the order forms on the Alliance for Telecommunication Industry Solutions (ATIS) website.	Qwest updated its LSOG documentation and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2042	Qwest did not publish instructions for the manual order End User (EU) Form. The information on Qwest's website did not appear on the order forms on the Alliance for Telecommunication Industry Solutions (ATIS) website.	Qwest updated its LSOG documentation and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2043	Qwest did not publish adequate instructions regarding the differences between the LSR Form on its website and the order Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) website.	Qwest updated its LSOG documentation and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2044	Qwest's LSOG and Wholesale websites stated that the "SC" field on the LSR is required. The LSOG site stated: "The list of current SC codes and guidelines to obtain new SC codes are located in Volume I (Administrative Information) of the OBF Binders." This information was unavailable.	Qwest updated its LSOG documentation and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2045	Qwest's hours of availability for the IMA GUI and IMA EDI interfaces are inconsistent with its proposed specified hours.	Qwest updated the VRU prompts for the Wholesale Services Help Desk and the Interconnect Service Center, and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the prompts and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2046	Qwest's Wholesale Forms website did not contain guidelines for completing the manual Centrex Resale Service Form.	Qwest updated its LSOG documentation and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2047	Qwest's Wholesale Forms website did not contain guidelines for completing the manual Direct Inward Dialing Resale Service Form.	Qwest updated its LSOG documentation and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2048	Qwest's Wholesale website did not provide adequate instructions regarding how to obtain a facility CSR from the trunk CSR when the facility number is not available.	Qwest updated the PCAT.	HP verified the updates. HP successfully retested. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2049	The P-CLEC submitted a pre-order transaction to obtain a CSR and a TN via telephone reservation. The P-CLEC then submitted an order to change the telephone number for the customer, but did not change the TN on the associated DL order. Qwest systems should have returned an error message. However, the order received a FOC and SOC.	Qwest implemented a Directory Listing edit and updated the IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation. Qwest sent the associated release notification.	HP verified the update and receipt of the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2050	Qwest's Wholesale website contains conflicting instructions regarding the required forms for manually ordering Resale Service.	Qwest updated its LSOG, the IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation, and its Wholesale Services website. Qwest also sent the associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2051	Qwest rejected an LSR for no Circuit ID. The Loop Service form was not listed as required in the Disclosure documents.	Qwest updated the IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation (Release 7.0 and 8.0), and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2052	When attempting to perform a UNE-P order, the P-CLEC omitted the feature detail information required for a service change, which should have resulted in an error message. Qwest worked the order through to completion.	Qwest implemented a business process layer edit and sent associated release notification.	HP verified receipt of the notification and retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2053	The IMA GUI Documentation and the IMA EDI Disclosure documents relating to the Customer Code (CC) field for Facility Based IMA GUI Directory listing orders are inconsistent.	Qwest provided explanations in its responses as to why the discrepancies appear.	HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2054	When attempting to perform a Seasonal Suspend, the P-CLEC typed an incorrect activity code. The P-CLEC expectation was to receive an error message, yet the order received a FOC.	Qwest implemented a system fix to properly identify the errors that generated this Exception.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2055	Qwest's IMA GUI and EDI Releases 6.0 and 7.0 fail to provide "address validation by TN" for new TNs established by a co-provider in Qwest's system.	Qwest added data to the PREMIS database, and issued internal communicators and associated release notifications.	HP verified the receipt of the notifications. HP's retest failed in the first iteration, but was successful the second time. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2056	Qwest did not reject an LSR Change Order to disconnect an auxiliary line that the P-CLEC submitted with an incorrect NPA. The Qwest Service Center processed the order. The order received both a FOC and SOC. According to Qwest's Wholesale Products and Services Business Procedures, the service order should have been rejected.	Qwest implemented a system edit to generate an error message before completion if the telephone number on the LSR and CSR do not match.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2057	Two separate instances occurred in which the P-CLEC submitted LSR resale business orders with requested due dates, but received both a FOC and SOC for the order later that same day.	Qwest provided explanations in its responses that a WFA script caused the early completion dates. Qwest implemented the WFA script to prevent actual dispatch for virtual test accounts (i.e., the specific circumstance described here was unique to the test environment and would not occur for actual CLECs).	HP acknowledged Qwest's explanations. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2058	After having successfully performed Telephone Number Availability Query (TNAQ) and Telephone Number Select Query (TNSQ) functions, the P-CLEC received a fatal error after the orders were submitted.	Qwest explained that this issue pertained to inaccurate documentation. Qwest updated its website and issued an internal communicator.	HP verified the updates. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2059	The P-CLEC could not successfully complete a High Capacity Facilities Request (HICAP). The P-CLEC advised the Qwest Help Desk that data was not in the TIRKS virtual database, and that Qwest would need to validate the data on the CSR for HICAP Facilities Request.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Training employees via internal communications and general notices to the Interconnect Service Center, and b.) Updating its IMA Reference Guide and web-based DS1 training, and c.) Implementing a system changes to edit a confusing HICAP error message and informational message.	HP verified that the edit was in place. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2060	The Qwest System does not support using a "Change" ACT Code to add a loop to an existing account. This is inconsistent with Qwest's disclosure documentation.	Qwest updated the IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation (Releases 6.0, 7.0 & 8.0), and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the documentation updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2061	Erroneous data was auto-populating into the "Reporting fax" field in a CEMR report. This erroneous data caused an error message that prevented the P-CLEC from canceling the trouble reports for both design and non-design products.	Qwest corrected an error in the "Reporting Fax" field on digital certificates.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2062	Due to an unplanned system outage, the P-CLEC could not submit trouble report transactions through the CEMR interface. Qwest did not send out any event notification regarding an unplanned Repair Call Expert (RCE) outage.	Qwest resolutions included: a) Updating the CEMR User Guide, b.) Deploying an RCE Release, and c.) Changing the wording in the error message.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2063	<p>In Qwest IMA EDI Release 6.0 and 7.0 and IMA GUI Release 6.0 and 7.0, the RLDQ pre-order function does not work properly when attempting to obtain Raw Loop Data information by Telephone Number (TN) and address.</p>	<p>Qwest resolutions included: a.) Implementing functionality into an IMA release 9.0-patch to allow a raw loop data query for Unbundled Loop accounts by assigned address, b.) Implementing a similar fix into IMA release 8.0 concurrent, c.) Updating the Raw Loop Data Job Aid 1, the IMA User's Guide, the Product Catalog, and EDI Disclosure Documents.</p>	<p>HP recommended that the Exception be closed, and that a new Observation (OBS 2078) would be issued regarding Qwest's plans to implement the RLDQ functionality for IMA EDI Release 9.0. HP closed the Exception.</p>
EXC 2064	<p>Qwest Account Management did not respond to the P-CLEC's requests for product and/or process explanations in a timely response. Further, any necessary clarification or correction of requested documentation is not provided, or provided with a delayed response. Qwest SMEs were unable to demonstrate appropriate expertise, nor could they not provide a timely resolution to outstanding issues and problems. The P-CLEC found a significant lack of Qwest AM processes or process documentation.</p>	<p>Qwest implemented a new senior service manager, and trained the other service managers in problem areas.</p>	<p>HP accepted Qwest's explanation. HP closed the Exception.</p>
EXC 2065	<p>The P-CLEC received 997 and 855 responses from Qwest, and received rejects on the orders, yet Qwest was not able to locate the transaction in its Operational Support Systems. Qwest's Help Desks could not provide adequate explanation for transaction rejects, citing only that business-processing layers were the issue.</p>	<p>Qwest provided explanations and appropriate clarifications regarding the Help Desk escalation channels.</p>	<p>HP accepted Qwest's responses. HP closed the Exception.</p>

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2066	The P-CLEC submitted IMA EDI Release 6.0 CSRQ transactions and received a "No CSR Found" error message. The P-CLEC resubmitted the identical EDI transactions and received complete CSRs from Qwest.	Qwest modified the IMA Release 6.0 software and sent the associated release notification.	HP verified receipt of the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2067	Qwest's ISC practices for processing orders are inconsistent with the published Qwest IMA EDI 6.0 Disclosure documentation and business rules. When processing an UNE order with a Desired Due Date, the P-CLEC received a FA, a Reject error, two FOCs, and a SOC.	Qwest stated that it would implement a code change to ensure the database retry flag is always reinitialized prior to invoking the LSR insert function. The code change ensures a reject error is not erroneously sent under these circumstances.	HP accepted this explanation, and closed all open items to Exception 2034. HP closed Exception 2067.
EXC 2068	The P-CLEC did not receive SOC's for UNE and Resale orders.	Qwest provided explanations regarding error PONs submitted by HP via confidential information.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception. Scenario 9, regarding jeopardy notices, was closed to Exception 2036.
EXC 2069	The instructions provided in the Qwest IMA GUI handbook and the Qwest Online Training for IMA-GUI are inadequate for completing a Facilities Availability Query for ISDN PRI.	Qwest updated its IMA 8.0 User Guide and the ISDN PRI Product Catalog. Qwest also issued internal communicators and external release notifications to the CLEC community.	HP verified the documentation updates and the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2070	Qwest's systems and documentation do not allow accurate processing of EEL orders for residential customers. CLECs must submit orders for residential customers with a "Business Services" Type of Service designation.	Qwest updated the Product Catalog and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2071	Qwest incorrectly rejected a" converting Resale ISDN PRI to UNE-P ISDN PRI" transaction. IMA GUI does not support using a "Change" action for an existing account to an ISDN PRI product to convert Resale ISDN PRI to UNE-P ISDN PRI product.	Qwest stated that the issues were caused by human error. Qwest coached its employees. However, it was decided that it was appropriate to close this Exception as it pertained to Resale ISDN PRI and UNE-P ISDN PRI, which was removed from the scope of Test 12 by Change Request #26 to the MTP.	HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2072	IMA GUI application returned USOC-related results that are inconsistent with P-CLEC expectations.	Qwest updated the IMA User Guide and sent associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2073	While attempting to place a conversion order from Resale ISDN PRI to UNE-P ISDN PRI via IMA GUI, the P-CLEC received a Reject Message from the Qwest ISC.	Qwest provided a list of process improvements. Qwest updated the Product Catalog and Product Conversion Chart.	HP verified Qwest's updates and notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2074	Qwest information provides conflicting instructions with regard to the Customer Service Record (CSR) on live accounts.	Qwest provided explanations in its responses that the order itself was perhaps in error.	HP reviewed its own internal logs and determined that Qwest's response was correct. The ECCKT in question was mistyped. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2075	The Qwest Help Desk was observed as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> unresponsive to trouble tickets, un knowledgeable on certain basic issues, providing conflicting status on P-CLEC orders, and providing conflicting referrals from Center personnel to other Qwest resources. 	Qwest made a number of improvements to the quality of service provided by its Help Desk.	HP's retests regarding ineffective and/or untimely assistance from the Qwest Help Desk noted efforts by Qwest to improve its services. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2076	The P-CLEC could not process a Local Service Request (LSR). The maintenance of co-provider BAN profiles may not be current. At times, the P-CLEC submitted a LSR with the BAN field populated and Qwest rejected the LSR.	Qwest stated error was the result of IMA software error attempting to derive fields from the BAN entry - fixed. Qwest updated its IMA Users Guide and the EDI Introduction to include BAN format rules by region.	HP verified Qwest's updates and industry notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2077	CSRs do not consistently include Central Office information, nor does Qwest's website. The P-CLEC contacted Qwest's ISC Help Desk and obtained the Central Office addresses.	Qwest implemented an IMA edit, and updated the I-Charts, the LSOG, and the IMA EDI 8.0 Disclosure Documentation. Qwest sent the associated release notification.	HP verified Qwest's system edit and documentation updates. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2078	Qwest's documentation does not provide "Yield to Glare" information, yet a Qwest representative stated that this information was required.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Updating the Product Catalog, b.) Updating the I-Charts, and c.) Sending the associated release notification.	HP verified Qwest's updates and the associated notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2079	The P-CLEC experienced delays in Carrier Facility Assignments (CFAs) becoming available after it had sent a "Supp to Cancel" on the pending order.	Qwest resolutions included: a.) Revising internal documents, b.) Developing report queries, and c.) Coaching employees.	HP retested and Qwest met the 95% established performance benchmark. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2080	The telephone number Qwest returned for a Pre-Order TN reservation is not consistent with the serving Central Office. The order was rejected. The Qwest Help Desk was contacted and could not resolve the issue.	Qwest resolutions included a.) Updating its Product Catalog, b.) Updating the IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation, c.) Updating the LSOG, and d.) Sending the associated industry notification.	HP verified the updates and associated notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2081	The process for "using placeholders for the TNs on Centrex 21 orders" was not documented in the EDI Disclosure Documentation. Both P-CLEC and Qwest personnel were confused by this omission.	Qwest resolutions included updating its IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation, LSOG, and I-Charts, and sending internal communicators.	HP verified Qwest's updates. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



invent

HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2082	Inconsistencies existed between Qwest IMA system functionality and published Disclosure Documentation for DLROs for IMA EDI Release 7.0 and IMA GUI Release 8.01. When the P-CLEC populated the ACNA field with the P-CLEC's ACNA, Qwest returned an error. However, when the ACNA field held the CCNA or RSID, the system returned the DLR.	Qwest proposed a back-end system fix. Qwest later determined that this fix was not feasible, and provided a work-around. Qwest published the workaround.	HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2083	Qwest documentation was inconsistent with actual practice for Service Completion Dates. Specifically, CSRs returned by Qwest do not contain information in the "origDate" (Original Service Establishment Date) field; yet the FBBDL order requires the "SCD" (Service Completion Date) field.	Qwest updated its IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation, I-Charts, LSOG, and IMA FBBDL Guide. Qwest sent the associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2084	Qwest provided conflicting information about the "Remarks" field for EEL orders. After a "Convert as Specified" order failed, the P-CLEC contacted Account Management, and was advised to enter the information in the Remarks field.	Qwest updated its IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation, I-Charts, and LSOG. Qwest sent the associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2085	The P-CLEC experienced failures with Facility Availability Query (FAQ) by Telephone Number (TN) in EDI 7.0 and IMA GUI 8.01. The TNs were not loaded in PREMIS.	Qwest implemented a system fix for FAQ.	HP retested successfully and closed the Exception.
EXC 2086	When the P-CLEC submitted LSRs with the SO field populated, the information in the field "dropped out" during transmission.	Qwest stated that the IMA EDI Release 7.0 translator was not passing the SO field to the back end systems. Qwest implemented a system fix to IMA EDI Release 7.0. Qwest sent the associated release notification.	HP verified the updates and receipt of the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential



HP Observations and Exceptions

Number	Summary	Qwest Resolution	HP Action and Disposition
EXC 2087	The P-CLEC encountered late or missing SOC's. Qwest completed internal service orders (i.e., sent a FOC with comments or Status Update), but the original LSR did not complete.	Qwest updated the PCAT and provided the "LSR Supplemental Processing Matrix" of internal processes to HP.	HP verified the updates. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2088	The P-CLEC submitted a SUPP to change the DDD. The FOC reflected the SUPP changed DDD, but the SOC reflected the original order DDD.	Qwest stated that the issues were caused by human error. Qwest performed internal training and issued an internal communicator.	HP acknowledged Qwest's explanations. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2089	The P-CLEC attempted to perform the LSR Status Inquiry. The function returned an error message.	Qwest stated that the LSRQ functionality in Release 7.0 of IMA EDI was not functioning properly. Qwest implemented a system fix in Release 7.0 and sent the required notification.	HP verified the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.
EXC 2090	Two CRIS 811 Invoices contradicted Qwest's published documentation for the LX and REF segments. It appeared that Qwest implemented system changes without a.) notifying the co-provider community and b.) publishing updated technical specifications. HP previously identified unannounced changes to CRIS interface in Observation 2011.	Qwest updated its Customer EDI Guide and sent the associated release notification.	HP verified the notification. HP retested successfully. HP closed the Exception.

Published by Hewlett-Packard - Confidential

Pre-Order/Order Integration

Field Comparison Report

Analysis of Qwest IMA EDI Release 7.0

Regional Oversight Committee (ROC)

3rd Party Test of Qwest Operational Support Systems

(OSS)



i n v e n t

The information contained in this document is provided as a basis for discussion and for informational purposes only, and does not constitute any commitment or obligation on the part of HP with respect to any future products, services or undertakings. No rights or licenses to any concepts or ideas contained in such information are granted to the recipient of this document. HP may in its sole discretion pursue, not pursue or modify any of its intentions or activities described in this document.



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Project Name: ROC 3 rd Party Test of Qwest OSS	Document Version No: 1.0
Project Manager: Geoff May	Document Version Date: 04/19/02
FocusPM Phase:	Preparation Date: 04/03/02
Quality Review Method:	Review Date:
Prepared By: Kathi A Frank	
Reviewed By:	

Distribution List

From	Date	Phone/Fax	
To	Action*	Due Date	Phone/Fax

*Action Types: Approve, Review, Inform, File, Action Required, Attend Meeting, Other (please specify)

Version History

Ver. No.	Ver. Date	Revised by	Description	Filename
1.0	First Public Release			

Proprietary Notice

The information contained in this Document constitutes a trade secret and/or information that is commercial or financial and confidential or privileged, prior to the Report's release by the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) on behalf of the 13 state Public Utilities Commission (PUC) participating in the ROC OSS Test. This document is furnished in confidence with the understanding that it will not, without the prior written permission of HP, be used or disclosed for other than evaluation purposes. This restriction does not limit the right to use or disclose this information if obtained from another source without restriction. HP makes no warranties, guarantees, or commitments to any party with regard to the information disclosed herein.

© Copyright 2002 by Hewlett-Packard Company All rights reserved.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential

Release Date: 4/19/02
Appendix HP-B

For Qwest, Regional Oversight
Committee, Hewlett-Packard Consulting,
KPMG Consulting, and MTG use only.

Page ii



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table of Contents

- 1. Definition of Terms/Acronyms 1
- 2. Reference Documents 1
- 3. Introduction 2
 - 3.1. Background 2
 - 3.2. Purpose 2
 - 3.3. Scope of this Document 2
 - 3.4. Documentation Available to CLECs 4
 - 3.5. Training Available to CLECs 4
- 4. Qwest IMA 7.0 Field Comparison 5
 - 4.1. Pre-Order 5
 - 4.1.1. Pre-Order Document Descriptions: Query and Response Forms 5
 - 4.1.2. Pre-Order Field Statistics 6
 - 4.1.3. Data Integration Issues 8
 - 4.1.3.1. Analysis of Data Integration Issues 16
 - 4.1.3.2. Analysis of Pre-Order Integration 17
 - 4.2. Order 17
 - 4.2.1. Order Document Descriptions 17
 - 4.2.2. Order Field Statistics 19
 - 4.2.3. Data Integration Issues 21
 - 4.2.3.1. Analysis of Data Integration Issues 31
 - 4.2.3.2. Analysis of Order Integration 32
 - 4.3. Post-Order 32
 - 4.3.1. Post-Order Document Descriptions 32
 - 4.3.2. Post-Order Field Statistics 32
 - 4.3.3. Data Integration Issues 35
 - 4.3.3.1. Analysis of Data Integration Issues 37
- 5. P-CLEC Data Integration 38
- 6. Summary of Findings 40

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

1. Definition of Terms/Acronyms

Table 1.1 identifies the acronyms used throughout this report.

Table 1.1 – Terms and Acronyms

Term	Definition
CLEC	Competitive Local Exchange Carrier
EDI	Electronic Data Interchange
FID	Field Identifier
HPC	Hewlett Packard Consulting
ILEC	Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier
IMA	Interconnect Mediated Access
LSOG	Local Service Ordering Guidelines
LSR	Local Service Request
OSS	Operation Support Systems
P-CLEC	Pseudo-Competitive Local Exchange Carrier
USOC	Universal Service Order Code

2. Reference Documents

Table 2.1 provides a complete list of documents used to compile information for this report.

Table 2.1 – Reference Documents

Documentation	Issued By
Local Service Ordering Guidelines (LSOG) Issue 3	Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS)
EDI Implementation Guidelines for Interconnect Mediated Access (IMA)	Qwest Communications, Inc.
Disclosure Document	Qwest Communications, Inc.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



3. Introduction

The *Introduction* provides a general background, purpose, and scope for this document and explains the reasons behind the document's generation.

3.1. Background

The Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) publishes and maintains the Local Service Ordering Guidelines (LSOG). The LSOG is the standard for ordering and provisioning within the Telecommunications Industry. A provider (ILEC) may interpret these guidelines when creating specifications that define how a CLEC should order and provision services from the ILEC.

The degree to which ILECs and CLECs conform to the LSOG guidelines has a direct impact on the internal application systems of both parties. The closer each company conforms to the other, the easier it is for the CLEC and ILEC that are exchanging data to build and maintain their respective internal application systems. This becomes even more critical when multiple CLECs and ILECs are exchanging and integrating data into their respective internal applications.

3.2. Purpose

This document analyzes Qwest Communications Inc. (Qwest) Operations Support Systems (OSS) guidelines, *IMA EDI Disclosure Document – Release 7.0*, and its adherence to the industry standard LSOG Issue 3 guidelines. This document further analyzes Qwest's conformity to pre-order, order, and post-order processing. All discrepancies, and their perceived impacts on a CLEC's ability to integrate, are documented.

Since criteria have not been established for HPC to assess the degree to which a CLEC can integrate with Qwest, this document does not include any recommendations. The document provides only the analysis that HPC performed based on a fundamental approach to integration.

3.3. Scope of this Document

This report's analysis is limited to those IMA EDI Disclosure Document chapters used by the P-CLEC during its execution of Master Test Plan (MTP) Test 12. The products and transactions covered in the chapters are listed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 – Products and Transactions included in MTP – Test 12

Products and Transactions	Type
Address Validation	Pre-Order
Appointment Availability	Pre-Order
Appointment Selection	Pre-Order
Cancellation	Pre-Order

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Products and Transactions	Type
Connecting Facility Assignment	Pre-Order
Customer Service	Pre-Order
Design Layout Record	Pre-Order
Facility Availability	Pre-Order
Meet Point	Pre-Order
Raw Loop Data	Pre-Order
Service Availability	Pre-Order
Telephone Number Availability	Pre-Order
Telephone Number Selection	Pre-Order
Centrex 21	Order
Centrex Plus	Order
DID In Only Trunks	Order
ISDN-PRI Resale Facility	Order
ISDN-PRI Resale Trunk	Order
Listing Only	Order
Local Number Portability	Order
PBX	Order
POTS	Order
Private Line	Order
Shared Loop	Order
Unbundled Loop Distribution Loop	Order
Unbundled Loop	Order
Unbundled Loop w/Number Portability	Order
UNE-C Private Line	Order
UNE-P POTS	Order
Completion	Post-Order
Firm Order Completion (FOC)	Post-Order
Jeopardy/Non-Fatal/Fatal	Post-Order
LSR Status	Post-Order
Status Change Inquiry- Auto Push	Post-Order

Each group of documents (pre-order, order, post-order) was analyzed to determine:

- Number of fields (Qwest and LSOG);
- Number of fields included in Qwest's Disclosure Document;
- Number of fields used by Qwest;

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

- Fields with integration issues;
- The impact those fields have on the integration process;
- How is the field initiated (ILEC, CLEC, constant, calculation or not used);
- Pre-Order to Pre-Order integration comparison;
- Pre-Order to Order integration; and,
- Post-Order integration.

When analyzing this information, the types of internal application systems an ILEC utilize was not a factor. Instead, HPC took a generalized approach to integration to determine which discrepancies might impact a CLEC's ability to integrate.

3.4. Documentation Available to CLECs

Qwest maintains the website, <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/ima/edi/document.html>, which contains all EDI documentation Qwest provides to CLECs. This website contains the *EDI Implementation Guidelines for Interconnect Mediated Access (IMA)* and a link to the *IMA EDI Disclosure Document – Release 7.0*.

The *EDI Implementation Guidelines for Interconnect Mediated Access (IMA)* provide a CLEC with information necessary to implement EDI processing with Qwest. The document defines both the implementation process and the technical guidelines required to achieve implementation.

Qwest's *IMA EDI Disclosure Document – Release 7.0* defines:

- EDI Business Model/Processes;
- Developer Worksheets - Business rules for pre-order, order and post order; and,
- EDI Trading Partner Access Information - Data mapping examples, enveloping and general guidelines.

The *IMA EDI Disclosure Document* is published on the Qwest website at <http://www.qwest.com/disclosures/netdisclosure409.html>.

Additionally, Qwest's *IMA EDI Disclosure Document* indicates that CLECs should reference the Qwest Technical Publications to further clarify fields contained in the *IMA EDI Disclosure Document*. The Technical Publications can be found on the Qwest website at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/notices/techPub.html>.

Qwest also maintains a listing of USOCs and FIDs on its website at <http://usocfidfind.qwest.com/>.

3.5. Training Available to CLECs

Qwest provides training information on their website at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/trainingNotice.html>.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



4. Qwest IMA 7.0 Field Comparison

The field comparison provides a parallel examination of Qwest forms against standardized LSOG 3 forms. The forms, etc., are compared on a field-to-field basis, the differences are explained, and any issues and impacts are identified. To facilitate the understanding, HP's field comparison is broken out into the standard chronological segments of the ordering process (pre-order, order, post-order, etc.).

HPC uses a basic criterion to identify issues: where a Qwest form differs from a standard form in its usage of an individual field, HPC determines whether or not Qwest's usage would complicate the ordering process. For example, where a standardized field may allow for up to fifty characters, and Qwest limits it to ten, HPC identifies this as an issue in that it may prevent a CLEC from entering the appropriate number of characters based on its particular data. If a field differs, but HPC cannot determine any noticeable impact, HPC notes the difference, but states that no impact is foreseeable. However, it should be noted that in all cases, HP's determination is limited to HP's experience, and does not necessarily represent the potential impacts to all CLECs.

4.1. Pre-Order

This section compares Qwest's pre-order forms to the LSOG 3 standard pre-order forms.

4.1.1. Pre-Order Document Descriptions: Query and Response Forms

Table 4.1 identifies and cross-references the Pre-Order query and response documents used in MTP Test 12 with the corresponding LSOG 3 form. LSOG 3 identifies only one pre-order form. This form is used to create eight (8) different Qwest pre-order transactions. Any form used by Qwest that was not part of LSOG 3 was considered by HPC to be a non-standard form. The non-standard forms included in Table 4.1 are: Connecting Facility Assignment, Customer Service Record, Design Layout Record, Meet Point and Raw Loop Data.

Table 4.1 - Pre-Order Query and Response Forms

Document Description	Query Form	Response Form	LSOG Form	Standard or Non Standard Form
Address Validation	AVQ	AVR	POPINQP	Standard
Appointment Availability	AAQ	AAR	POPINQP	Standard
Appointment Selection	ASQ	ASR	POPINQP	Standard
Cancellation	CTQ	CTR	POPINQP	Standard
Connecting Facility Assignment	CFAQ	CFAR		Non-Standard
Customer Service Record	CSRQ	CSRR		Non-Standard
Design Layout Record	DLRQ	DLRR		Non-Standard
Facility Availability	FAQ	FAR	POPINQP	Standard
Meet Point	MPQ	MPR		Non-Standard

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Document Description	Query Form	Response Form	LSOG Form	Standard or Non Standard Form
Raw Loop Data	RLDQ	RLDR		Non-Standard
Service Availability	SAQ	SAR	POPINQP	Standard
Telephone Number Availability	TNAQ	TNAR	POPINQP	Standard
Telephone Number Selection	TNSQ	TNSR	POPINQP	Standard

4.1.2. Pre-Order Field Statistics

First, HPC looked at the available pre-order fields as a whole, and then reviewed them on a form-by-form basis. For example, the SASN field is identified once in the LSOG as a field used in the pre-order process, and is used on multiple Qwest pre-order forms. In its analysis, HPC identifies the SASN as an individual Data Field.

Once the Data Field compilation was complete, HPC further analyzed whether Qwest included the field on a form, and whether Qwest used the field. Qwest's Disclosure Document defines Field Usage as "Required," "Conditional," "Optional," "Not Used," or "Prohibited." HPC identified only those fields that Qwest identifies as "Required," "Conditional," or "Optional" as actually used by Qwest.

In Table 4.2, HPC calculated the total number of pre-order data fields based on the number of LSOG 3 and Qwest-specific data fields. HPC identified Qwest-specific data fields as any data field that was not included in LSOG 3 as a pre-order data field.

Table 4.2 - Pre-Order Data Field Statistics

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	48	17%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	238	83%
Total Number of Data Fields	286	



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.3 indicates how many of the Total Number of Data Fields from Table 4.2 are included in the Qwest Disclosure Document for pre-order processing.

Table 4.3 - Pre-Order Data Field Inclusion by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Included	% of Total Included
Qwest-Specific Data Fields – Included	238	83%	238	87%
LSOG Data Fields – Included	37	13%	37	13%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Included	11	4%		
Total Number of Included Data Fields	286		275	

Table 4.4 indicates how many of the Total Number of Included Data Fields from Table 4.3 are used in the Qwest Disclosure Document for pre-order processing.

Table 4.4 - Pre-Order Data Field Usage by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Used	% of Total Used
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Used	234	85%	234	87%
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Not Used	4	1%		
LSOG Data Fields – Used	36	13%	36	13%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Used	1	0%		
Total Number of Used Data Fields	275		270	

Table 4.5 indicates the number of times each data field is used across all Qwest pre-order forms. This analysis identifies which fields are Qwest-specific fields, and which are LSOG fields.

Table 4.5 – Total Number of Pre-Order Data Field across all Forms

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	356	45%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	431	55%
Total Number of Data Fields	787	

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

4.1.3. Data Integration Issues

After reviewing the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document, HPC encountered various issues that could impact a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. These issues are classified into three categories:

- Generic Integration Issues (Table 4.6);
- Field Length Variations Across Qwest Pre-Order Forms (Table 4.7); and,
- Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG (Table 4.8).

The tables classify each issue's perceived impact on a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. Only fields used by Qwest are included in the tables.

Table 4.6 – Generic Integration Issues

Issue #	Qwest Field Number	Field Name	Form	Issue	Impact
1	CSRR-68 CSRR-72 CSRR-82 CSRR-88 CSRR-97	FFIDDATA	CSRR	Qwest defines the field length as variable. This field is mapped from the MSG01, which has a field length of 264. The field is not listed in either the Disclosure or the EDI Data Document as repeating. CLECs cannot determine the maximum field length.	Y
2	CSRR-68 CSRR-72 CSRR-82 CSRR-88 CSRR-97	FFIDDATA	CSRR	The FFID can define the FFIDDATA as being a TN. However, the TN format is not consistent with Qwest EDI requirements. The format may or may not include the area code. There also may not be a dash between the area code and the NXX; it appears that Qwest uses a space. This impacts the processing of multi-line account information.	Y
3	CSRR-55 CSRR-69	LFIDDATA	CSRR	Qwest defines the field length as variable. This field is mapped from the MSG01, which has a field length of 264. The field is not listed in either the Disclosure or the EDI Data Document as repeating. CLECs cannot determine the maximum field length.	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.7 – Field Length Variations Across Qwest Pre-Order Forms

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
4	BLDG	17	AVQ	15	The CSRR-48 is part of the Service Address in the Listings Section and is returned by Qwest. Since it is shorter, it should not have an impact.	N
		17	AVR	15		
		24b	AVR	15		
		24y	AVR	15		
		48	CSRR	9		
		19	FAQ	15		
		18	RLDQ	15		
		19	RLDR	15		
		17	TNAQ	15		
5	INVSTAT	18	CFAR	2	Both the CFAR and MPR list Valid Values for the INVSTAT field. The listings are not interchangeable. The CLEC must assume, though the field name appears on two different forms, the usage of the field is different for each form.	N
		13	MPR	7		
		16	MPR	7		
6	REQNUM	30	AAQ	2	Qwest does not use the REQNUM on the TNAQ. In the TNSQ, the REQNUM is a TN, while in the CTQ and AAQ it is a quantity. The CLEC must assume, though the field name appears on multiple forms, the usage of the field is different for each form.	N
		30	CTQ	6		
		30	TNAQ	17		
		30	TNSQ	12		
7	SALOC	20	AVQ	25	The SALOC on the RLDR is an optional field. Since a CLEC would not use the address from the RLDR as the validated address, there should not be an impact.	N
		20	AVR	25		
		24ag	AVR	25		
		31	CSRQ	25		
		51	CSRQ	25		
		71	CSRQ	25		
		116	CSRR	25		
		24	FAQ	25		
		23	RLDQ	25		
		22	RLDR	32		
20	TNAQ	25				
8	SANO	10	AVQ	8	The SANO on the RLDR is an	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		10	AVR	8	optional field. Since a CLEC would not use the address from the RLDR as the validated address, there should not be an impact.	
		24q	AVR	8		
		18	CSRQ	8		
		38	CSRQ	8		
		58	CSRQ	8		
		103	CSRR	8		
		39	CSRR	8		
		15	FAQ	8		
		11	RLDQ	8		
		11	RLDR	12		
		10	TNAQ	8		
9	SAPR	9	AVQ	5	The address submitted in the TNAQ must be a validated address. Since the AVQ/AVR allows five (5) characters, this could have an impact.	Y
		9	AVR	5		
		24p	AVR	5		
		17	CSRQ	5		
		37	CSRQ	5		
		57	CSRQ	5		
		38	CSRR	5		
		102	CSRR	5		
		14a	FAQ	5		
		10	RLDQ	5		
		10	RLDR	5		
9	TNAQ	4				
10	SASD	12	AVQ	2	While Qwest does not list the Valid Values for the SASD, it does indicate to follow the LSOG 3 guidelines. LSOG 3 indicates a listing for Valid Values. The maximum length for any field on the list is two (2) characters. This should not have an impact.	N
		12	AVR	2		
		24r	AVR	2		
		20	CSRQ	10		
		40	CSRQ	10		
		60	CSRQ	10		
		41	CSRR	2		
		105	CSRR	2		
		16a	FAQ	2		
		13	RLDQ	2		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		13	RLDR	2		
		12	TNAQ	2		
11	SASF	11	AVQ	4	The SASF at CSRR-40 is part of the Service Address in the Listing Section.	N
		11	AVR	4		
		24r	AVR	4		
		19	CSRQ	4		
		39	CSRQ	4		
		59	CSRQ	4		
		40	CSRR	5		
		104	CSRR	4		
		16	FAQ	4		
		12	RLDQ	4		
		12	RLDR	4		
11	TNAQ	4				
12	SAZC	22	AVQ	5	The SAZC on the RLDR is an optional field. Since a CLEC would not use the address from the RLDR as the validated address, there should not be an impact.	N
		22	AVR	5		
		24ai	AVR	5		
		26	FAQ	5		
		33	CSRQ	5		
		53	CSRQ	5		
		73	CSRQ	5		
		118	CSRR	5		
		25	RLDQ	5		
		24	RLDR	10		
22	TNAQ	5				
13	UNIT	24	CFAR	5	The CFAR usage of UNIT is in reference to the Cable Pair, while in the RLDR it is used in reference to the address. The CLEC must assume, though the field name appears on two different forms, the usage of the field is different for each form.	N
		17	RLDR	10		
14	USOCNUM	30b	AAQ	2	In all cases this field represents a quantity. Since the AAQ is an outbound field, this value can be	N
		73	CSRR	3		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		89	CSRR	3	calculated based on the number of USOCs provided.	

Table 4.8 – Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
15	26	APPRD	AAQ ASQ	8	12	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens and verbiage about AM or PM. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
16	17	BLDG	AVQ AVR CSRR FAQ RLDQ TNAQ	15	10	Since the Qwest field is longer, this could impact integration.	Y
17	3	D/TSENT	All Pre-Order Forms	12	15	LSOG allows for three (3) pre-printed hyphens and verbiage about AM or PM. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of 12 characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
18	36	FETAVA	SAQ	5	25	Qwest has set the value equal to the length of a USOC. Since the USOC has to be valid for Qwest, this should not cause an impact.	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
19	18	FLOOR	AVQ AVR CSRQ CSRR FAQ RLDQ RLDR TNAQ	15	3	Qwest specifications indicate that only the floor number has to be provided in the field (if no preface is given the default is floor). This should not cause an impact.	N
20	2	INQNUM	All Pre-Order Forms	22	16	Since the Qwest field is longer, this should not cause an impact.	N
21	8	INQRES#	AAR ASR CTQ	10	17	Since this is a Qwest-generated number, it will never be longer than 10 characters. This should not cause an impact.	N
22	28	QNR	TNAQ TNSQ	1	4	Qwest only allows CLECs to request up to nine (9) TNs. In the TNAQ, instead of using the QNR, Qwest uses TNQTY. This could cause an impact, as a CLEC must be able to specify in its system how it can request TNs from Qwest.	Y
23	30	REQNUM	AAQ CTQ TNSQ	2 6 12	17	Qwest uses the REQNUM field in the AAQ and CTQ to identify a quantity instead of the TN. The TNAQ uses it as a 12-character TN. The CLEC must assume, though the field name appears on multiple forms, the usage of the field is different for each form. This should not cause an impact.	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
24	16	ROOM	AVQ AVR CSRQ CSRR FAQ RLDQ RLDR TNAQ	15	9	Since the Qwest field is longer, this could impact integration.	Y
25	20	SALOC	AVQ AVR CSRQ CSRR FAQ RLDQ RLDR TNAQ	25	35	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.	Y
26	12	SASD	CSRQ	10	2	Qwest uses the directional abbreviations provided in LSOG. This should not cause an impact.	N
27	11	SASF	AVQ AVR CSRQ CSRR FAQ RLDQ RLDR TNAQ	4	5	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.	Y
28	22	SAZC	AVQ AVR CSRQ CSRR FAQ RLDQ RLDR TNAQ	5 5 5 5 5 5 10 5	12	Since the Qwest fields are shorter, this could cause an impact.	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
29	32	TNRES	CTQ TNAR	12	17	Qwest uses a 12-character phone number. This could cause an impact.	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

4.1.3.1. Analysis of Data Integration Issues

Table 4.9 indicates the Total Number of data fields with perceived integration issues.

Table 4.9 - Pre-Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number Non-Impacting	% of Non-Impacting	Total Number Impacting	% of Impacting	Total Number of Integration Issues	% of Total
Generic Integration Issues (Table 4.6)	0	0%	3	27%	3	10%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to Qwest) (Table 4.7)	10	56%	1	9%	11	38%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to LSOG) (Table 4.8)	8	44%	7	64%	15	52%
Total Number of Integration Issues	18		11		29	

Note: Six (6) of the same Data Fields appear on both the Qwest-to-Qwest listing and the Qwest-to-LSOG listing.

Table 4.10 summarizes and quantifies perceived integration issues, and shows the percentage of perceived integration issues against the total number of Data Fields Used by Qwest (Table 4.4).

Table 4.10 - Pre-Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of Non-Impacting Data Integration Issues	18	7%
Number of Impacting Data Integration Issues	11	4%
Total Number of Data Integration Issues	29	11%
Total Number of Used Data Fields	275	

Note: If the six (6) fields that appear in both the Qwest-to-Qwest and Qwest-to-LSOG listing of field length variations are only counted once, instead of twice, the percentage of "Total Number of Data Integration Issues" compared to the "Total Number of Used Data Fields" becomes eight percent (8%).



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

4.1.3.2. Analysis of Pre-Order Integration

HPC determined that the data fields used in the pre-order process can originate from the CLEC or Qwest, or they can be a constant value, a calculation, or a variable. HPC used this information to determine how many of the pre-order data fields were re-used from pre-order to pre-order. Table 4.11 identifies where HPC determined the data originated.

Table 4.11 - Pre-Order Data Field Origination

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of Pre-Order fields initiated by CLEC	56	21%
Number of Pre-Order fields initiated by Qwest	178	66%
Number of Pre-Order fields that are constants, calculations, or variable	36	13%
Total Number of Used Data Fields	270	

Table 4.12 identifies the number of pre-order fields that can be used across multiple pre-order forms. As an example, Qwest returns the COMPDATE to the CLEC on the AAR, and this field can subsequently be used on the ASQ and the ASR. When Qwest returns the COMPDATE field on the AAR, the CLEC must be able to integrate this data into its internal application systems in order to re-use the data on the ASQ.

Table 4.12 - Pre-Order Data Field Integration

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of fields used Pre-Order to Pre-Order	155	20%
Total Number of Data Fields Across All Forms	787	

4.2. Order

This section compares Qwest's order forms to the LSOG 3 standard order forms.

4.2.1. Order Document Descriptions

Table 4.13 identifies the types of EDI orders used in MTP Test 12.

Table 4.13 - Order Types

Order Description	LSR Type
Centrex 21	C21
Centrex Plus	CEX
DID In Only Trunks	DIOT
ISDN-PRI Resale Facility	ISPF

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Order Description	LSR Type
ISDN-PRI Resale Trunk	ISPT
Listing Only	LO
Local Number Portability	LNP
PBX	PBX
POTS	POTS
Private Line	PL
Shared Loop	SL
Unbundled Loop Distribution Loop	UDL
Unbundled Loop	LS
Unbundled Loop w/Number Portability	LSNP
UNE-C Private Line	UNEC
UNE-P POTS	UNEP

The Table 4.14 identifies and cross-references the Order forms used in MTP Test 12 with the corresponding LSOG 3 form. Qwest does not use any order forms that are not part of LSOG 3.

Table 4.14 - Order Forms

Form Name	Qwest Form	LSOG Form
Centrex	CRS	CRS
DID Resale Service	DRS	DRS
Directory Listing	DL	DL
Directory Service Request	DSR	DSR
End User	EU	EU
Local Service Request	LSR	LSR
Loop Service	LS	LS
Loop Service with Number Portability	LSNP	LSNP
Number Portability	NP	NP
Resale	RS	RS
Resale Private Line	RPL	RPL

Table 4.15 identifies by each LSR Type, the forms Qwest may require for a CLEC to generate an order, based on order activity.

Table 4.15 - Order Forms by LSR Type

LSR Type	Forms

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

LSR Type	Forms
C21	LSR, EU, CRS, DSR, DL
CEX	LSR, EU, CRS, DSR, DL
DIOT	LSR, EU, DRS, DL
ISPF	LSR, RPL
ISPT	LSR, EU, RS, DSR, DL
LO	LSR, EU, RS, DSR, DL
LNP	LSR, EU, NP
PBX	LSR, EU, RS, DSR, DL
POTS	LSR, EU, RS, DSR, DL
PL	LSR, RPL
SL	LSR, EU, LS
UDL	LSR, EU, LS
LS	LSR, EU, LS
LSNP	LSR, EU, LSNP
UNEC	LSR, RPL
UNEP	LSR, EU, RS, DSR, DL

4.2.2. Order Field Statistics

HPC first looked at the available order fields as a whole, and then reviewed them on a form-by-form basis.

Once the Data Field compilation was complete, HPC further analyzed whether Qwest included the field on a form, and whether Qwest used the field. Qwest's Disclosure Document defines Field Usage as "Required," "Conditional," "Optional," "Not Used," or "Prohibited." HPC identified only those fields that Qwest identifies as "Required," "Conditional," or "Optional" as Qwest-utilized.

In Table 4.16, HPC calculated the total number of order data fields based on the number of LSOG 3 and Qwest-specific data fields. HPC identified Qwest-specific data fields as any data field that was not included in LSOG 3.

Table 4.16 - Order Data Field Statistics

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	391	94%
Qwest Specific Data Fields	23	6%
Total Number of Data Fields	414	

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.17 identifies how many of the Total Number of Data Fields in Table 4.16 are included in the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document for order processing.

Table 4.17 - Order Data Field Inclusion by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Included	% of Total Included
Qwest-Specific Data Fields – Included	23	6%	23	6%
LSOG Data Fields – Included	390	94%	390	94%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Included	1	0%		
Total Number of Included Data Fields	414		413	

Table 4.18 identifies how many of the Total Number of Included Data Fields in Table 4.17 are used in the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document for order processing.

Table 4.18 - Order Data Field Usage by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Utilized	% of Total Utilized
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Used	19	5%	19	7%
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Not Used	4	1%		
LSOG Data Fields – Used	243	59%	243	93%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Used	147	36%		
Total Number of Used Data Fields	413		262	

Table 4.19 identifies the number of times each data field is used across all Qwest order forms. This analysis specifies which fields are Qwest-specific and which are LSOG fields.

Table 4.19 – Total Number of Order Data Fields across all Order Forms

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	5512	97%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	187	3%
Total Number of Data Fields	5699	



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

4.2.3. Data Integration Issues

After reviewing the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document, HPC encountered various issues that could impact a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. These issues are classified into three categories:

- Generic Integration Issues (Table 4.20);
- Field Length Variations Across Qwest Pre-Order Forms (Table 4.21); and,
- Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG (Table 4.22).

The tables classify each issue's perceived impact on a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. Only fields used by Qwest are included in the tables.

Table 4.20 – Generic Integration Issues

Issue #	Qwest Field Number	Field Name	Form	Issue	Impact
1	22	ACT	LSR	On the LSR form, the length of the ACT is one (1) character. However, in the EDI Data Mapping guidelines the field is cross-referenced to other values of one (1) to two (2) characters.	N
2	68 60	FEATURE DETAIL	CRS RS	Qwest documentation does not indicate that each Feature Detail can be sent to Qwest in its own EDI segment. It only indicates that the segment can repeat, and each Feature Detail must begin with a slash (/).	Y

Table 4.21 – Field Length Variations Across Qwest Order Forms

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
3	CITY	20	EU	25	The occurrences with a field length of 15 are all associated with the BILLNM. Qwest does not use the CITY at LSR-67. This could have an impact.	Y
		23	RPL	25		
		43	EU	15		
		51	RPL	25		
		67	LSR	15		
		70	RPL	15		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		80	LSR	25		
		97	LSR	25		
4	CKR	9	DRS	44	Qwest only uses the CKR on the DRS, LS and LSNP forms. This could have an impact.	Y
		10	LS	36		
		10	LSNP	36		
		10	NP	36		
		23	RS	41		
		42	CRS	36		
		91	RPL	36		
104	RPL	44				
5	ECCKT	13	LS	20	This could have an impact.	Y
		13	NP	20		
		15	LSNP	20		
		24	RS	24		
		92	RPL	20		
		105	RPL	20		
6	FEATURE DETAIL	51	RS	200	This could have an impact.	Y
		63	CRS	512		
7	NAME	8	EU	60	Qwest does not use the NAME field on the DSR form. This could have an impact.	Y
		76	DSR	25		
		91	DSR	25		
		10a	RPL	25		
		38a	RPL	25		
8	ORD	4	CRS	9	Qwest does not use the ORD field on the CRS form. This could have an impact.	Y
		5	DRS	20		
		6	RS	10		
9	PORTED#	14	NP	17	This could have an impact.	Y
		30	LSNP	12		
10	TCOPT	24	NP	3	This could have an impact.	Y
		30	LS	1		
		30	RS	1		
		40	LSNP	1		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		52	EU	3		
		47a	CRS	1		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.22 – Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
11	26	ACC	EU	255	115	This could have an impact.	Y
	35	ACC	RPL	255	45		
	63	ACC	RPL	255	45		
12	7	AN	LSR	16	20	This could have an impact.	Y
13	13	APPTIME	LSR	9	11	This should not have an impact, as the A (for AM) or P (for PM) can easily be removed.	N
14	31	AUTHNM	LSR	25	15	This should not have an impact because it is a CLEC generated field.	N
15	53	BAN1	LSR	16	13	This should not have an impact because the BAN is defined by the ILEC.	N
16	55	BAN2	LSR	16	13	This should not have an impact because the BAN is defined by the ILEC.	N
17	19	BLDG	EU	15	9	This could have an impact.	Y
	20	BLDG	RPL	15	9		
	48	BLDG	RPL	15	9		
18	7	CB	CRS	18	8	This could have an impact.	Y
19	14	CFA	LS	54	42	In the CFAQ, the CFA is made up of five (5) fields with a total length of 42. This should not have an impact.	N
	16	CFA	LSNP	54	42		
	48	CFA	RS	54	42		
	93	CFA	RPL	54	42		
	106	CFA	RPL	54	42		
20	32	CFTN	LSNP	12	13	Since the Qwest field is shorter. this	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
						should not have an impact.	
21	43	CITY	EU	15	25	This could have an impact.	Y
	70	CITY	RPL	15	25		
22	9	CKR	DRS	44	41	This should not have an impact. A CIRCUIT in the pre-order is 20 characters. The CKR in the DRS allows for a range. Even if one pre-printed hyphen is included, the length is 41.	N
	10	CKR	LS	36	41		
	10	CKR	LSNP	36	41		
23	11	D/TSENT	LSR	12	17	LSOG allows for three (3) pre-printed hyphens and verbiage about AM or PM. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of 12 characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
24	30	DATED	LSR	8	10	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
25	101	DDALOC	DSR	25	35	This could have an impact.	Y
26	94	DDASF	DSR	4	5	This could have an	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
						impact.	
27	103	DDAZC	DSR	5	12	This could have an impact.	Y
28	12	DDD	LSR	8	10	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
29	14	DDDO	LSR	8	10	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
30	16	DFDT	LSR	4	6	This should not have an impact because the difference is the addition of AM or PM.	N
31	8	DIDNUM	DRS	3	4	Since this is a CLEC-assigned number, it should not have an impact.	N
32	78	DISCECCKT	RPL	20	41	Qwest ECCKTs in pre-order are only 20 characters. This should not have an impact	N
33	49	DNUM	EU	4	5	Since this is a CLEC-assigned number, it should not have an impact.	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
34	19	DRTI	DRS	4	10	This field in LSOG has a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of 10 characters. It should not have an impact	N
35	23	DSUP	DSR	2	1	This could have an impact.	Y
36	35	EAN	EU	16	20	Since Qwest's field is shorter, it should not have an impact.	N
37	13	ECCKT	LS	20	41	Qwest provides the circuit ID with a length of 20 characters. There should not be an impact.	N
	15	ECCKT	LSNP	20	41		
	24	ECCKT	RS	24	41		
	92	ECCKT	RPL	20	41		
	105	ECCKT	RPL	20	41		
38	50	FEATURE	RS	5	6	Since Qwest uses a USOC in this field, and all Qwest USOCs are five (5) characters, it should not have an impact.	N
	62	FEATURE	CRS	5	6		
39	51	FEATUREDETAIL	RS	200	24	Qwest documentation does not indicate that CLECs can send multiple MSG segments per FID Detail by beginning each segment with a slash (/). If the CLEC is not made aware of this capability, it could be an issue.	Y
	63	FEATUREDETAIL	CRS	512	24		
40	17	FLOOR	EU	15	4	Since the Qwest field is longer, this could have an impact.	Y
	21	FLOOR	RPL	15	9		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
	41	FLOOR	EU	15	4	could have an impact.	
	49	FLOOR	RPL	15	9		
	68	FLOOR	RPL	15	4		
41	105	HID	LSR	4	12	Since Qwest business rules specify a specific format, the field length should not cause an impact.	N
42	102	HNUM	LSR	3	5	Since this is an incremental number beginning with 001, it should not cause an impact.	N
43	110	HTSEQ	LSR	512	10	Since the Qwest field is longer, and contains definite formatting options, this could have an impact.	Y
44	28	INTEXT	DSCR	75	50	Although the Qwest field is longer, the field is primarily used for New Listing and Directory Only. Therefore, it should not have an impact.	N
45	41	LALOC	DL	25	35	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could have an impact.	Y
46	35	LASF	DL	4	5	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could have an impact.	Y
47	8	LNUM	LS	4	5	Qwest indicates this is a sequential number beginning with one (1). This should not cause	N
	8	LNUM	LSNP	4	5		
	8	LNUM	NP	4	5		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
	9	LNUM	RS	4	5	an impact.	
	29	LNUM	CRS	4	5		
48	95	LOCNUM	RPL	4	3	Qwest defines this field as having a maximum of two (2) characters. This should not have an impact.	N
49	5	LQTY	LS	4	3	This could have an impact.	Y
	5	LQTY	LSNP	4	3		
50	39	LTC	CRS	4	2	This could have an impact.	Y
51	8	NAME	EU	60	25	This could have an impact.	Y
52	6	ORD	RS	10	20	Since Qwest assigns this number, it should not cause an impact.	N
53	14	PORTED#	NP	17	12	This could have an impact.	Y
54	27	REMARKS	DRS	255	160	Since the REMARKS are determined by the CLEC, this should not cause an impact	N
	30	REMARKS	NP	255	160		
	36	REMARKS	LS	255	160		
	46	REMARKS	LSNP	255	160		
	58	REMARKS	EU	255	160		
	67	REMARKS	DL	255	160		
	73	REMARKS	DSR	255	160		
	79	REMARKS	RPL	255	160		
100	REMARKS	LSR	255	160			
55	18	ROOM	EU	15	9	This could have an impact.	Y
	22	ROOM	RPL	15	9		
	42	ROOM	EU	15	9		
	50	ROOM	RPL	15	9		
	69	ROOM	RPL	15	10		
56	45	RORD	LSR	10	17	Since this is a Qwest provided	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
						number, it should not have an impact	
57	3	RSQTY	CRS	3	5	This could have an impact.	Y
58	11	SASF	EU	4	5	This could have an impact.	Y
	13	SASF	RPL	4	5		
	41	SASF	RPL	4	5		
59	12	SEQTEXT	DSCR	75	85	This could have an impact.	Y
60	23	SEQTEXT1	DSCR	75	85	This could have an impact.	Y
61	21	SUP	LSR	2	1	This could have an impact.	Y
62	30	TCOPT	LS	1	3	Although the field is defined in LSOG as three (3) characters, the valid values are only one (1) character in length. This should not have an impact	N
	40	TCOPT	LSNP	1	3		
63	29	TCPER	NP	8	10	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
	33	TCPER	RS	8	10		
	35	TCPER	LS	8	10		
	57	TCPER	EU	8	10		
64	13	TLI	RS	12	14	This should not have an impact.	N
	107	TLI	LSR	12	14		
65	14	TN	RS	12	23	This should not have an impact.	N
	32	TN	CRS	12	23		
66	22	ZIPCODE	EU	5	10	This could have an	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
	25	ZIPCODE	RPL	5	10	impact.	
	45	ZIPCODE	EU	5	10		
	53	ZIPCODE	RPL	5	10		
	72	ZIPCODE	RPL	5	10		

4.2.3.1. Analysis of Data Integration Issues

Table 4.23 identifies the total number of data fields with perceived integration issues.

Table 4.23 -Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number Non-Impacting	% of Non-Impacting	Total Number Impacting	% of Impacting	Total Number of Integration Issues	% of Total
Generic Integration Issues	1	3%	1	3%	2	3%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to Qwest)	0	0%	8	24%	8	12%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to LSOG)	31	97%	25	74%	56	85%
Total Number of Integration Issues	32		34		66	

Note: The eight (8) Data Fields on the Qwest-to-Qwest listing are also present on the Qwest-to-LSOG listing.

Table 4.24 compares the percentage of data fields with perceived integration issues against the “Total Number of Data Fields Used by Qwest” in Table 4.18.

Table 4.24 -Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of Non-Impacting Data Integration Issues	32	8%
Number of Impacting Data Integration Issues	34	8%
Total Number of Data Integration Issues	66	16%
Total Number of Used Data Fields	413	

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Note: If the eight (8) fields that appear in both the Qwest-to-Qwest and Qwest-to-LSOG listings of field length variations are only counted once, instead of twice, the percentage of "Total Number of Data Integration Issues" compared to the "Total Number of Used Data Fields" becomes 14 percent.

4.2.3.2. Analysis of Order Integration

Table 4.25 illustrates the number of pre-order fields that can be used across multiple order forms. For example, Qwest returns the COMPTIME to the CLEC on the AAR. CLECs can subsequently use this data on the LSR form in the APPTIME field. When Qwest returns the COMPDATE field on the AAR, the CLEC must be able to integrate this data into its internal application systems in order to re-use the data on the LSR form.

Table 4.25 - Order Data Field Integration

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of fields used Pre-Order to Order	117	2%
Total Number of Data Fields Across All Order Forms	5699	

4.3. Post-Order

This section compares Qwest's post-order forms to the LSOG 3 standard post-order forms.

4.3.1. Post-Order Document Descriptions

Table 4.26 identifies the Post-Order query and response documents used in MTP Test 12, and cross-references them with the corresponding LSOG 3 form. HPC considered any form Qwest used that was not part of LSOG 3 to be a non-standard form. Table 4.26 identifies those forms as Completion, LSR Status Query, and Status Change.

Table 4.26 - Post-Order Forms

Document Description	Qwest Form	LSOG Form	Standard or Non Standard Form
Completion	CN		Non-Standard
Jeopardy (includes Non-Fatal, Fatal)	JEOP	LSC	Standard
LSR Status Query / Response	LSRSQ/LSRSR		Non-Standard
Order FOC and Supplemental	FOC	LSC	Standard
Status Change Inquiry- Auto Push	SU		Non-Standard

4.3.2. Post-Order Field Statistics

HPC first looked at the available post-order fields as a whole, and then reviewed them on a form-by-form basis.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Once the Data Field compilation was complete, HPC further analyzed whether Qwest included the field on a form, and whether Qwest used the field. Qwest's Disclosure Document defines Field Usage as "Required," "Conditional," "Optional," "Not Used," or "Prohibited." HPC identified only those fields that Qwest identifies as "Required," "Conditional," or "Optional" as Qwest-utilized.

In Table 4.27, HPC calculated the total number of post-order data fields based on the number of LSOG fields and Qwest-specific data fields. HPC identified Qwest-specific data fields as any post-order data field that was not included in LSOG 3.



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.27 – Post-Order Data Field Statistics

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	98	64%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	54	36%
Total Number of Data Fields	152	

Table 4.28 indicates how many of the “Total Number of Data Fields” in Table 4.27 are included in the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document for post-order processing.

Table 4.28 - Post-Order Data Field Inclusion by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Included	% of Total Included
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Included	54	36%	54	36%
LSOG Data Fields – Included	97	64%	97	64%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Included	1	1%		
Total Number of Included Data Fields	152		151	

Table 4.29 indicates how many of the “Total Number of Included Data Fields” in Table 4.28 are used in the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document for post-order processing.

Table 4.29 - Post-Order Data Field Usage by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Used	% of Total Used
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Used	54	36%	54	52%
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Not Used	0	0%		
LSOG Data Fields – Used	49	32%	49	48%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Used	48	32%		
Total Number of Used Data Fields	151		103	

Table 4.30 identifies the number of times each data field is used across all of the Qwest post-order forms. This analysis specifies which are Qwest-specific fields and which are LSOG fields.

Table 4.30 – Total Number of Post-Order Data Fields across all Forms

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	157	69%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	69	31%
Total Number of Data Fields	226	

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

4.3.3. Data Integration Issues

After reviewing the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document, HPC encountered various issues that could impact a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. These issues are classified into the three categories below:

- Generic Integration Issues (Table 4.31);
- Field Length Variations Across Qwest Pre-Order Forms (Table 4.32);
- Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG (Table 4.33).

The tables classify each issue's perceived impact on a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. Only fields used by Qwest are included in the tables.

Table 4.31 – Generic Integration Issues

Issue #	Qwest Field Number	Field Name	Form	Issue	Impact
1	81	DINIT	FOC	In the FOC, Qwest lists field 81 as DINIT. LSOG 3 lists the field as RT.	N
2	5	CD/TSENT	CN	In the Completion, Qwest lists CD/TSENT as C/TSENT.	N

Table 4.32 – Field Length Variations Across Qwest Post-Order Forms

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
3	DRTI	23	CN	4	The Qwest business rules indicate that this field is returned from the product specific forms. On the DRS, the field length is four (4). This should not be an issue.	N
		42	FOC	4		
		61e	FOC	10		
4	ORD	8	CN	10	Qwest does not use this field on the FOC at field seven (7). The CN indicates that this field is obtained from the FOC. This could impact integration.	Y
		7	FOC	20		
		50c	FOC	20		
		9	LSRSQ	10		
5	ORDNUM	11	JEP	10	This should not cause an impact.	N
		6	CN	3		
		50a	FOC	3		
		16	LSRSR	10		
		10	SU	10		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
6	TELNO	15	FOC	12	This should not cause an impact.	N
		32	FOC	17		
7	TLI	16a	CN	14	This should not cause an impact.	N
		36	FOC	14		
		60a	FOC	12		

Table 4.33 – Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
8	4	AN	FOC	16	20	This should not have an impact.	N
9	22	BAN1	FOC	16	13	This could have an impact.	Y
10	24	BAN2	FOC	16	13	This could have an impact.	Y
11	11	CD/TSENT	FOC	12	17	This should not have an impact.	N
12	55	CFA	FOC	54	42	Qwest defines the length of the CFA as 42. This should not have an impact.	N
13	53	CKR	FOC	36	41	Qwest defines its circuits with a length of 20 characters. The CKR can also be a range. This could have an impact.	Y
14	54	ISPID	FOC	15	14	This could have an impact.	Y
15	6	LSRNO	FOC	11	18	This should not have an impact.	N
16	7	ORD	JEP	10	20	This should not have an impact.	N
17	58	PORTED#	FOC	17	12	This could have an impact.	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
18	77	RECCKT	FOC	24	41	This should not have an impact.	N
19	102	REMARKS	FOC	500	160	This could have an impact.	Y
20	32	TELNO	FOC	17	12	This could have an impact.	Y
21	61	TER	FOC	4	8	This should not have an impact.	N
22	51	TN	FOC	12	23	This should not have an impact.	N

4.3.3.1. Analysis of Data Integration Issues

Table 4.34 indicates the total number of post-order data fields with perceived integration issues.

Table 4.34 – Post-Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number Non-Impacting	% of Non-Impacting	Total Number Impacting	% of Impacting	Total Number of Integration Issues	% of Total
Generic Integration Issues	2	13%	0	0%	2	9%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to Qwest)	5	33%	0	0%	5	23%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to LSOG)	8	53%	7	100%	15	68%
Total Number of Integration Issues	15		7		22	

Note: The two (2) Data Fields on the Qwest-to-Qwest listing are also present on the Qwest-to-LSOG listing.

Table 4.35 indicates the percentage of data fields with perceived integration issues against the “Total Number of Data Fields Used by Qwest” in Table 4.29.

Table 4.35 – Post-Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of Non-Impacting Data Integration Issues	15	10%
Number of Impacting Data Integration Issues	7	5%
Total Number of Data Integration Issues	22	15%
Total Number of Utilized Data Fields	151	

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Note: If the two (2) fields that appear in both the Qwest-to-Qwest and Qwest-to-LSOG listing of field length variations are only counted once, the percentage of "Total Number of Data Integration Issues" compared to the "Total Number of Used Data Fields" becomes 13 percent.

5. P-CLEC Data Integration

As part of MTP Test 12, the P-CLEC implemented the following pre-order to pre-order integration functions. The P-CLEC initially added address information into an address table that was subsequently used to populate address fields in the AVQ, CSRQ, FAQ, SAQ, TNAQ, RLDQ and MPQ. Table 5.1 identifies those fields that were integrated in pre-order to pre-order processing.

Table 5.1 – PCG Pre-Order to Pre-Order Integration

Field in Address Table	Maps to AVQ	Maps to CSRQ	Maps to FAQ	Maps to SAQ	Maps to TNAQ	Maps to RLDQ	Maps to MPQ
LNAME	LNAME	CUSTNAME					
SANO	SANO	SANO	SANO		SANO	SANO	
SASF	SASF	SASF	SASF		SASF	SASF	
SASN	SASN	SASN	SASN		SASN	SASN	
ROOM	ROOM		ROOM		ROOM	ROOM	
BLDG	BLDG		BLDG		BLDG	BLDG	
FLOOR	FLOOR		FLOOR		FLOOR	FLOOR	
AHN	AHN		AHN		AHN	AHN	
ROUTE	ROUTE		ROUTE		ROUTE	ROUTE	
BOX	BOX		BOX		BOX	BOX	
SALOC	SALOC	SALOC	SALOC		SALOC	SALOC	
SAST	SAST	SAST	SAST	SAST	SAST	SAST	
SAZC	SAZC		SAZC		SAZC	SAZC	
CALA	CALA		CALA		CALA	CALA	
SITEID					SITEID		
TTA					TTA		
LSO			LSO	LSO			LSO

As part of MTP Test 12, the P-CLEC implemented the following pre-order to order integration functions. The P-CLEC initially added address information into an address table that was subsequently used to populate address fields in the LSR, EU, RPL and DL forms. The P-CLEC also used USOC information from CSRR to load Service and Equipment information into a table that was subsequently used in the RS form. Table 5.2 identifies those fields that were integrated in pre-order to order processing.



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 5.2 – PCG Pre-Order to Order Integration

Table	Data Field	Maps to LSR	Maps to EU	Maps To RS	Maps to RPL	Maps to DL
Address	LNAME		NAME			
Address	SANO		SANO		SANO	LANO
Address	SASF		SASF		SASF	LASF
Address	SASN		SASN		SASN	LASN
Address	ROOM		ROOM		ROOM	
Address	BLDG		BLDG		BLDG	
Address	FLOOR		FLOOR		FLOOR	
Address	AHN		AHN		AHN	
Address	ROUTE		ROUTE		ROUTE	
Address	BOX		BOX		BOX	
Address	SALOC		CITY		CITY	LALOC
Address	SAST		STATE		STATE	LAST
Address	SAZC		ZIPCODE		ZIPCODE	LAZC
Address	CALA		CALA		CALA	
Address	LSO	LSO			RLSO	
Cust Svc	# TN			RSQTY		
Cust Svc	TN			TN		
Cust Svc	PIC			PIC		
Cust Svc	LPIC			LPIC		
Cust Svc	USOC			FEATURE		
Cust Svc	ACTIVITY			FA		
Cust Svc	FFID			FEATUREDETAIL in the format "/FFID"space"FFID DATA. Do not map FFID = PIC, LPIC, or TN.		
Cust Svc	FFIDDATA			FEATUREDETAIL in the format "/FFID"space"FFID DATA. Do not map FFID= PIC, LPIC, or TN.		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



6. Summary of Findings

The integration process is highly dependent on the internal application system(s), EDI translator, telecom expertise and integration experience of the CLEC. With that stated, HPC does not feel that there are any issues that would prohibit a CLEC from integrating Qwest data with their internal application system(s). This does not mean that there are not issues that would have to be resolved between Qwest and the CLEC, but simply that these issues are not insurmountable.

HP Consulting

Pre-Order/Order Integration

Field Comparison Report

Analysis of Qwest IMA EDI Release 8.0

Regional Oversight Committee (ROC)

3rd Party Test of Qwest Operational Support Systems

(OSS)



i n v e n t

The information contained in this document is provided as a basis for discussion and for informational purposes only, and does not constitute any commitment or obligation on the part of HP with respect to any future products, services or undertakings. No rights or licenses to any concepts or ideas contained in such information are granted to the recipient of this document. HP may in its sole discretion pursue, not pursue or modify any of its intentions or activities described in this document.



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Project Name:	ROC 3 rd Party Test of Qwest OSS	Document Version No:	1.0
Project Manager:	Geoff May	Document Version Date:	04/19/02
FocusPM Phase:		Preparation Date:	04/03/02
Quality Review Method:		Review Date:	
Prepared By:	Kathi A Frank		
Reviewed By:			

Distribution List

From	Date	Phone/Fax	
To	Action*	Due Date	Phone/Fax

*Action Types: Approve, Review, Inform, File, Action Required, Attend Meeting, Other (please specify)

Version History

Ver. No.	Ver. Date	Revised by	Description	Filename
1.0	First Public Release			

Proprietary Notice

The information contained in this Document constitutes a trade secret and/or information that is commercial or financial and confidential or privileged, prior to the Report's release by the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) on behalf of the 13 state Public Utilities Commission (PUC) participating in the ROC OSS Test. This document is furnished in confidence with the understanding that it will not, without the prior written permission of HP, be used or disclosed for other than evaluation purposes. This restriction does not limit the right to use or disclose this information if obtained from another source without restriction. HP makes no warranties, guarantees, or commitments to any party with regard to the information disclosed herein.

© Copyright 2002 by Hewlett-Packard Company All rights reserved.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential

Release Date: 4/19/02
Appendix HP-C

For Qwest, Regional Oversight Committee,
Hewlett-Packard Consulting,
KPMG Consulting, and MTG use only.

Page ii



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table of Contents

1.	Definition of Terms/Acronyms	1
2.	Reference Documents	1
3.	Introduction	2
3.1.	Background	2
3.2.	Purpose	2
3.3.	Scope of this Document	2
3.4.	Documentation Available to CLECs	4
3.5.	Training Available to CLECs	4
4.	Qwest IMA 8.0 Field Comparison	5
4.1.	Pre-Order	5
4.1.1.	Pre-Order Document Descriptions: Query and Response Forms	5
4.1.2.	Pre-Order Field Statistics	6
4.1.3.	Data Integration Issues	8
4.1.3.1.	Analysis of Data Integration Issues	16
4.1.3.2.	Analysis of Pre-Order Integration	16
4.2.	Order	17
4.2.1.	Order Document Descriptions	17
4.2.2.	Order Field Statistics	19
4.2.3.	Data Integration Issues	20
4.2.3.1.	Analysis of Data Integration Issues	31
4.2.3.2.	Analysis of Order Integration	32
4.3.	Post-Order	33
4.3.1.	Post-Order Document Descriptions	33
4.3.2.	Post-Order Field Statistics	33
4.3.3.	Data Integration Issues	35
4.3.3.1.	Analysis of Data Integration Issues	37
5.	Summary of Findings	39



1. Definition of Terms/Acronyms

Table 1.1 identifies the acronyms used throughout this report.

Table 1.1 – Terms and Acronyms

Term	Definition
CLEC	Competitive Local Exchange Carrier
EDI	Electronic Data Interchange
FID	Field Identifiers
HPC	Hewlett Packard Consulting
ILEC	Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier
IMA	Interconnect Mediated Access
LSOG	Local Service Ordering Guidelines
LSR	Local Service Request
OSS	Operation Support Systems
P-CLEC	Pseudo-Competitive Local Exchange Carrier
USOC	Universal Service Order Code

2. Reference Documents

Table 2.1 provides a complete list of documents used to compile information for this report.

Table 2.1 – Reference Documents

Documentation	Issued By
Local Service Ordering Guidelines (LSOG) Issue 5	Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS)
EDI Implementation Guidelines for Interconnect Mediated Access (IMA)	Qwest Communications, Inc.
Disclosure Document	Qwest Communications, Inc.



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

3. Introduction

The *Introduction* provides a general background, purpose, and scope for this document and explains the reasons behind the document's generation.

3.1. Background

The Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS) publishes and maintains the Local Service Ordering Guidelines (LSOG). The LSOG is the standard for ordering and provisioning within the Telecommunications Industry. A provider (ILEC) may interpret these guidelines when creating specifications that define how a CLEC should order and provision services from the ILEC.

The degree to which ILECs and CLECs conform to the LSOG guidelines has a direct impact on the internal application systems of both parties. The closer each company conforms to the other, the easier it is for the CLEC and ILEC that are exchanging data to build and maintain their respective internal application systems. This becomes even more critical when multiple CLECs and ILECs are exchanging and integrating data into their respective internal applications.

3.2. Purpose

This document analyzes Qwest Communications Inc. (Qwest) Operations Support Systems (OSS) guidelines, *IMA EDI Disclosure Document – Release 8.0*, and its adherence to the industry standard LSOG Issue 5 guidelines. This document further analyzes Qwest's conformity to pre-order, order, and post-order processing. All discrepancies, and their perceived impacts on a CLEC's ability to integrate, are documented.

Since criteria have not been established for HPC to assess the degree to which a CLEC can integrate with Qwest, this document does not include any recommendations. The document provides only the analysis that HPC performed based on a fundamental approach to integration.

3.3. Scope of this Document

This report's analysis is limited to those documents used by the P-CLEC during its execution of Master Test Plan (MTP) Test 12 and Test 15. Although all of the forms were not used as part of Test 15, the analysis includes all of the documents used in Test-12. These products and transactions are listed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 – Products and Transactions included in MTP – Test 15

Products and Transactions	Type
Address Validation	Pre-Order
Appointment Availability	Pre-Order
Appointment Selection	Pre-Order

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Products and Transactions	Type
Cancellation	Pre-Order
Connecting Facility Assignment	Pre-Order
Customer Service	Pre-Order
Design Layout Record	Pre-Order
Facility Availability	Pre-Order
Meet Point	Pre-Order
Raw Loop Data	Pre-Order
Service Availability	Pre-Order
Telephone Number Availability	Pre-Order
Telephone Number Selection	Pre-Order
Centrex 21	Order
Centrex Plus	Order
DID In Only Trunks	Order
ISDN-PRI Resale Facility	Order
ISDN-PRI Resale Trunk	Order
Listing Only	Order
Local Number Portability	Order
PBX	Order
POTS	Order
Private Line	Order
Shared Loop	Order
Unbundled Loop Distribution Loop	Order
Unbundled Loop	Order
Unbundled Loop w/Number Portability	Order
UNE-C Private Line	Order
UNE-P POTS	Order
Completion	Post-Order
Firm Order Completion (FOC)	Post-Order
Jeopardy/Non-Fatal/Fatal	Post-Order
LSR Status	Post-Order
Status Change Inquiry- Auto Push	Post-Order

Each group of documents (pre-order, order, post-order) was analyzed to determine:

- Number of fields (Qwest and LSOG);
- Number of fields included in Qwest's Disclosure Document;

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

- Number of fields used by Qwest;
- Fields with integration issues;
- The impact those fields have on the integration process;
- How is the field initiated (ILEC, CLEC, constant, calculation or not used);
- Pre-Order to Pre-Order integration comparison;
- Pre-Order to Order integration; and,
- Post-Order integration.

When analyzing this information, the types of internal application systems an ILEC utilize was not a factor. Instead, HPC took a generalized approach to integration to determine which discrepancies might impact a CLEC's ability to integrate.

3.4. Documentation Available to CLECs

Qwest maintains the website, <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/ima/edi/document.html>, which contains all EDI documentation Qwest provides to CLECs. This website contains the *EDI Implementation Guidelines for Interconnect Mediated Access (IMA)* and a link to the *IMA EDI Disclosure Document – Release 8.0*.

The *EDI Implementation Guidelines for Interconnect Mediated Access (IMA)* provide a CLEC with information necessary to implement EDI processing with Qwest. The document defines both the implementation process and the technical guidelines required to achieve implementation.

Qwest's *IMA EDI Disclosure Document – Release 8.0* defines:

- EDI Business Model/Processes;
- Developer Worksheets - Business rules for pre-order, order and post order; and,
- EDI Trading Partner Access Information - Data mapping examples, enveloping and general guidelines.

The *IMA EDI Disclosure Document* is published on the Qwest website at <http://www.qwest.com/disclosures/netdisclosure409.html>.

Additionally, Qwest's *IMA EDI Disclosure Document* indicates that CLECs should reference the Qwest Technical Publications to further clarify fields contained in the *IMA EDI Disclosure Document*. The Technical Publications can be found on the Qwest website at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/notices/techPub.html>.

Qwest also maintains a listing of USOCs and FIDs on its website at <http://usocfidfind.qwest.com/>.

3.5. Training Available to CLECs

Qwest provides training information on their website at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/trainingNotice.html>.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



4. Qwest IMA 8.0 Field Comparison

The field comparison provides a parallel examination of Qwest forms against standardized LSOG 5 forms. The forms, etc., are compared on a field-to-field basis, the differences are explained, and any issues and impacts are identified. To facilitate the understanding, HP's field comparison is broken out into the standard chronological segments of the ordering process (pre-order, order, post-order, etc.).

HPC uses a basic criterion to identify issues: where a Qwest form differs from a standard form in its usage of an individual field, HPC determines whether or not Qwest's usage would complicate the ordering process. For example, where a standardized field may allow for up to fifty characters, and Qwest limits it to ten, HPC identifies this as an issue in that it may prevent a CLEC from entering the appropriate number of characters based on its particular data. If a field differs, but HPC cannot determine any noticeable impact, HPC notes the difference, but states that no impact is foreseeable. However, it should be noted that in all cases, HP's determination is limited to HP's experience, and does not necessarily represent the potential impacts to all CLECs.

4.1. Pre-Order

This section compares Qwest's pre-order forms to the LSOG 5 standard pre-order forms.

4.1.1. Pre-Order Document Descriptions: Query and Response Forms

Table 4.1 identifies and cross-references the Pre-Order query and response documents used in MTP Test 12 with the corresponding LSOG 5 form. LSOG 5 identifies two pre-order forms, the Pre-Order Process (POP) and the Customer Service Inquiry (CSI). The POP form is used to create eight (8) different Qwest pre-order transactions. Any form used by Qwest that was not part of LSOG 5 was considered by HPC to be a non-standard form. The non-standard forms included in Table 4.1 are: Connecting Facility Assignment, Customer Service Record, Design Layout Record, Meet Point and Raw Loop Data.

Note: HPC did compare Qwest's Customer Service Record to the CSI form in LSOG 5. Since the LSOG Field numbers that Qwest provides in the *IMA EDI Disclosure Document* did not match the LSOG field numbers of the CSI, HPC concluded that the Qwest's Customer Service Record is not based on the CSI form in LSOG 5.



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.1 - Pre-Order Query and Response Forms

Document Description	Query Form	Response Form	LSOG Form	Standard or Non Standard Form
Address Validation	AVQ	AVR	POP	Standard
Appointment Availability	AAQ	AAR	POP	Standard
Appointment Selection	ASQ	ASR	POP	Standard
Cancellation	CTQ	CTR	POP	Standard
Connecting Facility Assignment	CFAQ	CFAR		Non-Standard
Customer Service Record	CSRQ	CSRR		Non-Standard
Design Layout Record	DLRQ	DLRR		Non-Standard
Facility Availability	FAQ	FAR	POP	Standard
Meet Point	MPQ	MPR		Non-Standard
Raw Loop Data	RLDQ	RLDR		Non-Standard
Service Availability	SAQ	SAR	POP	Standard
Telephone Number Availability	TNAQ	TNAR	POP	Standard
Telephone Number Selection	TNSQ	TNSR	POP	Standard

4.1.2. Pre-Order Field Statistics

First, HPC looked at the available pre-order fields as a whole, and then reviewed them on a form-by-form basis. For example, the SASN field is identified once in the LSOG as a field used in the pre-order process, and is used on multiple Qwest pre-order forms. In its analysis, HPC identifies the SASN as an individual Data Field.

Once the Data Field compilation was complete, HPC further analyzed whether Qwest included the field on a form, and whether Qwest used the field. Qwest's Disclosure Document defines Field Usage as "Required," "Conditional," "Optional," "Not Used," or "Prohibited." HPC identified only those fields that Qwest identifies as "Required," "Conditional," or "Optional" as actually used by Qwest.

In Table 4.2, HPC calculated the total number of pre-order data fields based on the number of LSOG 5 and Qwest-specific data fields. HPC identified Qwest-specific data fields as any data field that was not included in LSOG 5 as a pre-order data field.

Table 4.2 - Pre-Order Data Field Statistics

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	91	28%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	238	72%
Total Number of Data Fields	329	

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.3 indicates how many of the Total Number of Data Fields from Table 4.2 are included in the Qwest Disclosure Document for pre-order processing.

Table 4.3 - Pre-Order Data Field Inclusion by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Included	% of Total Included
Qwest-Specific Data Fields – Included	238	72%	238	79%
LSOG Data Fields – Included	64	19%	64	21%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Included	27	8%		
Total Number of Included Data Fields	329		302	

Table 4.4 indicates how many of the Total Number of Included Data Fields from Table 4.3 are used in the Qwest Disclosure Document for pre-order processing.

Table 4.4 - Pre-Order Data Field Usage by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Used	% of Total Used
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Used	234	77%	234	85%
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Not Used	4	1%		
LSOG Data Fields – Used	40	13%	40	15%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Used	24	8%		
Total Number of Used Data Fields	302		274	

Table 4.5 indicates the number of times each data field is used across all Qwest pre-order forms. This analysis identifies which fields are Qwest-specific fields, and which are LSOG fields.

Table 4.5 – Total Number of Pre-Order Data Field across all Forms

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	504	53%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	454	47%
Total Number of Data Fields	958	

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

4.1.3. Data Integration Issues

After reviewing the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document, HPC encountered various issues that could impact a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. These issues are classified into three categories:

- Generic Integration Issues (Table 4.6);
- Field Length Variations Across Qwest Pre-Order Forms (Table 4.7); and,
- Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG (Table 4.8).

The tables classify each issue's perceived impact on a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. Only fields used by Qwest are included in the tables.

Table 4.6 – Generic Integration Issues

Issue #	Qwest Field Number	Field Name	Form	Issue	Impact
1	CSRR-59 CSRR-73 CSRR-83 CSRR-89 CSRR-98	FFIDDATA	CSRR	Qwest defines the field length as variable. This field is mapped from the MSG01, which has a field length of 264. The field is not listed in either the Disclosure or the EDI Data Document as repeating. CLECs cannot determine the maximum field length.	Y
2	CSRR-59 CSRR-73 CSRR-83 CSRR-89 CSRR-98	FFIDDATA	CSRR	The FFID can define the FFIDDATA as being a TN. However, the TN format is not consistent with Qwest EDI requirements. The format may or may not include the area code. There also may not be a dash between the area code and the NXX; it appears that Qwest uses a space. This impacts the processing of multi-line account information.	Y
3	CSRR-56 CSRR-70	LFIDDATA	CSRR	Qwest defines the field length as variable. This field is mapped from the MSG01, which has a field length of 264. The field is not listed in either the Disclosure or the EDI Data Document as repeating. CLECs cannot determine the maximum field length.	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Qwest Field Number	Field Name	Form	Issue	Impact
4	CSRR86	HEADDTL	CSRR	Qwest defines the field length as variable. This field is mapped from the PID05, which has a field length of 80. The field is not listed in either the Disclosure or the EDI Data Document as repeating. CLECs cannot determine the maximum field length.	Y

Table 4.7 – Field Length Variations Across Qwest Pre-Order Forms

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
5	BLDG	24	AVQ	15	The CSRR-49 is part of the Service Address in the Listings Section and is returned by Qwest. Since it is shorter, it should not have an impact.	N
		25	AVR	15		
		46	AVR	15		
		78	AVR	15		
		49	CSRR	9		
		24	FAQ	15		
		18	RLDQ	15		
		19	RLDR	15		
		20	TNAQ	15		
6	CITY	31	AVQ	25	The CITY on the RLDR is an optional field. Since a CLEC would not use the address from the RLDR as the validated address, there should not be an impact.	N
		31	AVR	25		
		85	AVR	25		
		33	CSRQ	25		
		63	CSRQ	25		
		92	CSRQ	25		
		50	CSRR	25		
		65	CSRR	25		
		117	CSRR	25		
		30	FAQ	25		
		23	RLDQ	25		
		22	RLDR	32		
		32	TNAQ	25		
7	ECCKT	38	CSRQ	20	Since a CLEC would not use the	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		66	CSRQ	20	ECCKT from the RLDR as the validated address, there should not be an impact.	
		14	CSRR	20		
		36	FAQ	20		
		34	FAR	20		
		8A	RLDR	60		
8	INVSTAT	18	CFAR	2	Both the CFAR and MPR list Valid Values for the INVSTAT field. The listings are not interchangeable. The CLEC must assume, though the field name appears on two different forms, the usage of the field is different for each form.	N
		13	MPR	7		
		16	MPR	7		
9	QNR	68	CSRQ	1	In all cases this field represents a quantity. Since the fields are outbound fields, these values can be calculated.	N
		44	TNAQ	2		
10	REQNUM	29	AAQ	2	The CLEC must assume, though the field name appears on multiple forms, the usage of the field is different for each form.	N
		16	TNAR	6		
11	SANO	11	AVQ	8	The SANO on the RLDR is an optional field. Since a CLEC would not use the address from the RLDR as the validated address, there should not be an impact.	N
		11	AVR	8		
		62	AVR	8		
		14	CSRQ	8		
		44	CSRQ	8		
		73	CSRQ	8		
		40	CSRR	8		
		104	CSRR	8		
		17	FAQ	8		
		11	RLDQ	8		
		11	RLDR	12		
13	TNAQ	8				
12	SAPR	10	AVQ	5	The address submitted in the TNAQ must be a validated address. Since the AVQ/AVR allows five (5) characters, this could have an impact.	Y
		10	AVR	5		
		61	AVR	5		
		13	CSRQ	5		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		43	CSRQ	5		
		72	CSRQ	5		
		39	CSRR	5		
		103	CSRR	5		
		16	FAQ	5		
		10	RLDQ	5		
		10	RLDR	5		
		12	TNAQ	4		
13	SASD	13	AVQ	2	While Qwest does not list the Valid Values for the SASD, it does indicate to follow the LSOG 5 guidelines. LSOG 5 indicates a listing for Valid Values. The maximum length for any field on the list is two (2) characters. This should not have an impact.	N
		16	CSRQ	10		
		46	CSRQ	10		
		75	CSRQ	10		
		42	CSRR	2		
		106	CSRR	2		
		19	FAQ	2		
		13	RLDQ	2		
		13	RLDR	2		
15	TNAQ	2				
14	SASF	12	AVQ	4	The SASF at CSRR-41 is part of the Service Address in the Listing Section.	N
		13	AVR	4		
		64	AVR	4		
		15	CSRQ	4		
		45	CSRQ	4		
		74	CSRQ	4		
		41	CSRR	5		
		105	CSRR	4		
		18	FAQ	4		
		12	RLDQ	4		
		12	RLDR	4		
14	TNAQ	4				
15	SELNUM	10	CTQ	2	The SELNUM is a calculation on the CTQ, and a TN on the TNSQ. The CLEC must assume, though the field	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		9	TNSQ	12	name appears on two different forms, the usage of the field is different for each form.	
16	UNIT	24	CFAR	5	The CFAR usage of UNIT is in reference to the Cable Pair, while in the RLDR it is used in reference to the address. The CLEC must assume, though the field name appears on two different forms, the usage of the field is different for each form.	N
		17	RLDR	10		
17	USOCNUM	31	AAQ	2	In all cases this field represents a quantity. Since the AAQ is an outbound field, this value can be calculated based on the number of USOCs provided.	N
		74	CSRR	3		
		90	CSRR	3		
18	ZIP	33	AVQ	5	Since the SAQ should use the ZIP from the validated address, this should not be an impact. Since a CLEC would not use the address from the CSRR or the RLDR as the validated address, there should not be an impact.	N
		33	AVR	5		
		87	AVR	5		
		52	CSRR	10		
		67	CSRR	10		
		32	FAQ	5		
		25	RLDQ	5		
		24	RLDR	10		
		28	SAQ	10		
34	TNAQ	5				

Table 4.8 – Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
19	34	ALTADDNUM	AVR	3	2	Since the Qwest field is longer, this could impact integration.	Y
20	36	APPRD	AAQ ASQ	8	12	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens and verbiage about AM or PM. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
						format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	
21	29	CITY	AVQ AVR FAQ TNAQ	25	32	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could impact integration.	Y
22	3	D/TSENT	All Pre-Order Forms	12	17	LSOG allows for three (3) pre-printed hyphens and verbiage about AM or PM. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of 12 characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
23	62	ECCKT	FAQ FAR	20	41	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this should not cause an impact.	N
24	47	FETAVA	SAQ	5	25	Qwest has set the value equal to the length of a USOC. Since the USOC has to be valid for Qwest, this should not cause an impact.	N
25	38	QNR	TNAQ	1	4	Qwest only allows CLECs to request up to nine (9) TNs. This could cause an impact, as a CLEC must be able to specify in its system how it can request TNs from Qwest.	Y
26	30	REQNUM	AAQ TNAR	6	15	Qwest uses the REQNUM field in the AAQ to identify a quantity instead of the TN. The TNAQ uses it as the 6-character LSO. The CLEC must assume, though the field name appears on multiple forms, the usage of the field is different for each	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
						form. This should not cause an impact.	
27	15	SANO	AVQ AVR FAQ TNAQ	8	10	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.	Y
28	14	SAPR	AVQ AVR FAQ TNAQ	4	6	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.	Y
29	19	SASN	AVQ AVR FAQ TNAQ	50	60	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.	Y
30	21	SASS	AVQ AVR FAQ TNAQ	4	5	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.	Y
31	20	SATH	AVQ AVR FAQ TNAQ	10	7	Since the Qwest field is longer, this could cause an impact.	Y
32	32	TNRES	CTQ TNAR	12	17	Qwest uses a 12-character phone number. This could cause an impact.	Y
33	2	TXNUM	All Pre-Order Forms	22	16	Since the Qwest field is longer, this should not cause an impact.	N
34	53	WTN	AAQ AVQ AVR FAQ	12	10	Since the Qwest field is longer, this could cause an impact.	Y
35	31	ZIP	AVQ AVR	5	12	Since the Qwest fields are shorter, this could cause an impact.	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
			FAQ TNAQ				

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

4.1.3.1. Analysis of Data Integration Issues

Table 4.9 indicates the Total Number of data fields with perceived integration issues.

Table 4.9 - Pre-Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number Non-Impacting	% of Non-Impacting	Total Number Impacting	% of Impacting	Total Number of Integration Issues	% of Total
Generic Integration Issues (Table 4.6)	0	0%	4	25%	4	11%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to Qwest) (Table 4.7)	13	68%	1	6%	14	40%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to LSOG) (Table 4.8)	6	32%	11	69%	17	49%
Total Number of Integration Issues	19		16		35	

Note: Eight (8) of the same Data Fields appear on both the Qwest-to-Qwest listing and the Qwest-to-LSOG listing.

Table 4.10 summarizes and quantifies perceived integration issues, and shows the percentage of perceived integration issues against the total number of Data Fields Used by Qwest (Table 4.4).

Table 4.10 - Pre-Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of Non-Impacting Data Integration Issues	19	7%
Number of Impacting Data Integration Issues	16	6%
Total Number of Data Integration Issues	35	13%
Total Number of Used Data Fields	274	

Note: If the eight (8) fields that appear in both the Qwest-to-Qwest and Qwest-to-LSOG listing of field length variations are only counted once, instead of twice, the percentage of "Total Number of Data Integration Issues" compared to the "Total Number of Used Data Fields" becomes ten percent (10%).

4.1.3.2. Analysis of Pre-Order Integration

HPC determined that the data fields used in the pre-order process can originate from the CLEC or Qwest, or they can be a constant value, a calculation, or a variable. HPC used this information to determine how many of the pre-order data fields were re-used from pre-order to pre-order. Table 4.11 identifies where HPC determined the data originated.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.11 - Pre-Order Data Field Origination

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of Pre-Order fields initiated by CLEC	55	17%
Number of Pre-Order fields initiated by Qwest	183	56%
Number of Pre-Order fields that are constants, calculations, or variable	91	28%
Total Number of Used Data Fields	329	

Table 4.12 identifies the number of pre-order fields that can be used across multiple pre-order forms. As an example, Qwest returns the COMPDATE to the CLEC on the AAR, and this field can subsequently be used on the ASQ and the ASR. When Qwest returns the COMPDATE field on the AAR, the CLEC must be able to integrate this data into its internal application systems in order to re-use the data on the ASQ.

Table 4.12 - Pre-Order Data Field Integration

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of fields used Pre-Order to Pre-Order	142	15%
Total Number of Data Fields Across All Forms	958	

4.2. Order

This section compares Qwest's order forms to the LSOG 5 standard order forms.

4.2.1. Order Document Descriptions

Table 4.13 identifies the types of EDI orders used in MTP Test 12.

Table 4.13 - Order Types

Document Description	LSR Type
Centrex 21	C21
Centrex Plus	CEX
DID In Only Trunks	DIOT
ISDN-PRI Resale Facility	ISPF
ISDN-PRI Resale Trunk	ISPT
Listing Only	LO
Local Number Portability	LNP
PBX	PBX
POTS	POTS
Private Line	PL

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Document Description	LSR Type
Shared Loop	SL
Unbundled Loop Distribution Loop	UDL
Unbundled Loop	LS
Unbundled Loop w/Number Portability	LSNP
UNE-C Private Line	UNEC
UNE-P POTS	UNEP

The Table 4.14 identifies and cross-references the Order forms used in MTP Test 12 with the corresponding LSOG 5 form. Qwest does not use any order forms that are not part of LSOG 5.

Table 4.14 - Order Forms

Form Name	Qwest Form	LSOG Form
Centrex	CRS	CRS
DID Resale Service	DRS	DRS
Directory Listing	DL	DL
Directory Service Request	DSR	DSR
End User	EU	EU
Local Service Request	LSR	LSR
Loop Service	LS	LS
Loop Service with Number Portability	LSNP	LSNP
Number Portability	NP	NP
Resale	RS	RS
Resale Private Line	RPL	RPL

Table 4.15 identifies by each LSR Type, the forms Qwest may require for a CLEC to generate an order, based on order activity.

Table 4.15 - Order Forms by LSR Type

LSR Type	Forms
C21	LSR, EU, CRS, DL
CEX	LSR, EU, CRS, DL
DIOT	LSR, EU, DRS, DL
ISPF	LSR, RPL
ISPT	LSR, EU, RS, DL

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

LSR Type	Forms
LO	LSR, EU, RS, DL
LNP	LSR, EU, NP
PBX	LSR, EU, RS, DL
POTS	LSR, EU, RS, DL
PL	LSR, RPL
SL	LSR, EU, LS
UDL	LSR, EU, LS
LS	LSR, EU, LS
LSNP	LSR, EU, LSNP
UNEC	LSR, RPL
UNEP	LSR, EU, RS, DL

4.2.2. Order Field Statistics

HPC first looked at the available order fields as a whole, and then reviewed them on a form-by-form basis.

Once the Data Field compilation was complete, HPC further analyzed whether Qwest included the field on a form, and whether Qwest used the field. Qwest's Disclosure Document defines Field Usage as "Required," "Conditional," "Optional," "Not Used," or "Prohibited." HPC identified only those fields that Qwest identifies as "Required," "Conditional," or "Optional" as Qwest-utilized.

In Table 4.16, HPC calculated the total number of order data fields based on the number of LSOG 5 and Qwest-specific data fields. HPC identified Qwest-specific data fields as any data field that was not included in LSOG 5.

Table 4.16 - Order Data Field Statistics

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	353	94%
Qwest Specific Data Fields	39	6%
Total Number of Data Fields	392	

Table 4.17 identifies how many of the Total Number of Data Fields in Table 4.16 are included in the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document for order processing.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.17 - Order Data Field Inclusion by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Included	% of Total Included
Qwest-Specific Data Fields – Included	39	10%	39	10%
LSOG Data Fields – Included	353	90%	353	90%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Included	0	0%		
Total Number of Included Data Fields	392		392	

Table 4.18 identifies how many of the Total Number of Included Data Fields in Table 4.17 are used in the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document for order processing.

Table 4.18 - Order Data Field Usage by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Utilized	% of Total Utilized
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Used	36	9%	36	14%
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Not Used	3	1%		
LSOG Data Fields – Used	219	56%	219	86%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Used	134	34%		
Total Number of Used Data Fields	392		255	

Table 4.19 identifies the number of times each data field is used across all Qwest order forms. This analysis specifies which fields are Qwest-specific and which are LSOG fields.

Table 4.19 – Total Number of Order Data Fields across all Order Forms

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	5033	92%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	466	8%
Total Number of Data Fields	5499	

4.2.3. Data Integration Issues

After reviewing the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document, HPC encountered various issues that could impact a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. These issues are classified into three categories:

- Generic Integration Issues (Table 4.20);
- Field Length Variations Across Qwest Pre-Order Forms (Table 4.21);and,
- Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG (Table 4.22).

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

The tables classify each issue's perceived impact on a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. Only fields used by Qwest are included in the tables.

Table 4.20 – Generic Integration Issues

Issue #	Qwest Field Number	Field Name	Form	Issue	Impact
1	24	ACT	LSR	On the LSR form, the length of the ACT is one (1) character. However, in the EDI Data Mapping guidelines the field is cross-referenced to other values of one (1) to two (2) characters.	N
2	68 60	FEATURE DETAIL	CRS RS	Qwest documentation does not indicate that each Feature Detail can be sent to Qwest in its own EDI segment. It only indicates that the segment can repeat, and each Feature Detail must begin with a slash (/).	Y

Table 4.21 – Field Length Variations Across Qwest Order Forms

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
3	CITY	98	DL	25	The occurrences with a field length of 15 are all associated with the BILLNM. Qwest does not use the CITY at LSR-67. This could have an impact.	Y
		24	EU	25		
		48	EU	15		
		27	RPL	25		
		61	RPL	25		
		82	RPL	15		
4	CKR	10	DRS	44	Qwest only uses the CKR on the DRS, LS and LSNP forms. This could have an impact.	Y
		10	LS	36		
		12	LSNP	36		
5	ECCKT	13	LS	20	Qwest provides the circuit ID with a length of 20 characters. There should not be an impact.	N
		17	LSNP	20		
		104	RPL	20		
		119	RPL	20		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		28	RS	24		
6	FEATURE DETAIL	68	CRS	512	This could have an impact.	Y
		60	RS	200		
7	LOCNUM	29	CRS	3	Qwest defines this field as having a maximum of two (2) characters. This should not have an impact.	N
		7	EU	3		
		109	LSR	3		
		9	RPL	3		
		43	RPL	3		
		109	RPL	4		
8	NAME	8	EU	60	This could have an impact.	Y
		10a	RPL	25		
		44a	RPL	25		
9	ORD	5	DRS	20	This could have an impact.	Y
		6	RS	10		
10	PORTED#	34	LSNP	12	This could have an impact.	Y
		15	NP	17		
11	TCOPT	56a	CRS	1	This could have an impact.	Y
		57	EU	3		
		32	LS	1		
		45	LSNP	1		
		26	NP	3		
		35	RS	1		

Table 4.22 – Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
12	30	ACC	EU	255	115	This could have an impact.	Y
	39	ACC	RPL	255	45		
	73	ACC	RPL	255	45		
13	11	ALI	DL	3	6	This could have an impact.	Y
14	7	AN	LSR	16	20	This could have an	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
						impact.	
15	15	APPTIME	LSR	9	11	This should not have an impact, as the A (for AM) or P (for PM) can easily be removed.	N
16	37	AUTHNM	LSR	25	15	This should not have an impact because it is a CLEC generated field.	N
17	61	BAN1	LSR	16	13	This should not have an impact because the BAN is defined by the ILEC.	N
18	63	BAN2	LSR	16	13	This should not have an impact because the BAN is defined by the ILEC.	N
19	7	CB	CRS	18	8	This could have an impact.	Y
20	14	CFA	LS	54	42	In the CFAQ, the CFA is made up of five (5) fields with a total length of 42. This should not have an impact.	N
	18	CFA	LSNP	54	42		
	57	CFA	RS	54	42		
	105	CFA	RPL	54	42		
	120	CFA	RPL	54	42		
21	32	CFTN	LSNP	12	13	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this should not have an impact.	N
22	98	CITY	DL	25	32	This could have an impact.	Y
	24	CITY	EU	25	32		
	48	CITY	EU	15	25		
	27	CITY	RPL	25	32		
	61	CITY	RPL	25	32		
	82	CITY	RPL	15	32		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
23	10	CKR	DRS	44	41	This should not have an impact. A CIRCUIT in the pre-order is 20 characters. The CKR in the DRS allows for a range. Even if one pre-printed hyphen is included, the length is 41.	N
	10	CKR	LS	36	41		
	12	CKR	LSNP	36	41		
24	12	D/TSENT	LSR	12	17	LSOG allows for three (3) pre-printed hyphens and verbiage about AM or PM. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of 12 characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
25	36	DATED	LSR	8	10	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
26	85	DDANO	DL	8	10	This could have an impact.	Y
27	84	DDAPR	DL	5	6	This could have an impact.	Y
28	88	DDASN	DL	50	60	This could have an impact.	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
29	14	DDD	LSR	8	10	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
30	16	DDDO	LSR	8	10	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
31	19	DFDT	LSR	4	6	This should not have an impact because the difference is the addition of AM or PM.	N
32	8	DIDNUM	DRS	3	4	Since this is a CLEC-assigned number, it should not have an impact.	N
33	103	DIRQTYA	DL	5	4	Qwest lists the Valid Values for the DIRQTYA as a blank or one (1) character. This should not have an impact.	N
34	104	DIRQTYNC	DL	5	4	Qwest lists the Valid Values for the DIRQTYA as a blank or one (1) character. This should not have an	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
						impact.	
35	90	DISCECCKT	RPL	20	41	Qwest ECCKTs in pre-order are only 20 characters. This should not have an impact	N
36	54	DNUM	EU	4	5	Since this is a CLEC-assigned number, it should not have an impact.	N
37	5	DQTY	EU	3	5	This could have an impact.	Y
	6	DQTY	RPL	3	5		
38	20	DRTI	DRS	4	10	This field in LSOG has a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of 10 characters. It should not have an impact	N
39	40	EAN	EU	16	20	Since Qwest's field is shorter, it should not have an impact.	N
40	13	ECCKT	LS	20	41	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this should not cause an impact.	N
	17	ECCKT	LSNP	20	41		
	28	ECCKT	RS	24	41		
	104	ECCKT	RPL	20	41		
	119	ECCKT	RPL	20	41		
41	79	FATN	DL	12	20	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this should not cause an impact.	N
42	67	FEATURE	RS	5	6	Since Qwest uses a USOC in this field, and all Qwest USOCs are five (5) characters, it should not have an impact.	N
	59	FEATURE	CRS	5	6		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
43	68	FEATUREDETAIL	CRS	512	24	Qwest documentation does not indicate that CLECs can send multiple MSG segments per FID Detail by beginning each segment with a slash (/). If the CLEC is not made aware of this capability, it could be an issue.	Y
44	46	FLOOR	EU	15	10	Since the Qwest field is longer, this could have an impact.	Y
	80	FLOOR	RPL	15	10		
45	113	HID	LSR	4	12	Since Qwest business rules specify a specific format, the field length should not cause an impact.	N
46	110	HNUM	LSR	3	5	Since this is an incremental number beginning with 001, it should not cause an impact.	N
47	118	HTSEQ	LSR	512	10	Since the Qwest field is longer, and contains definite formatting options, this could have an impact.	Y
48	70	LALOC	DL	25	35	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could have an impact.	Y
49	63	LANO	DL	8	10	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could have an impact.	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
50	62	LAPR	DL	5	6	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could have an impact.	Y
51	66	LASN	DL	50	60	Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could have an impact.	Y
52	68	LASS	DL	4	2	Qwest defines this field as having a maximum of two (2) characters. This should not have an impact.	N
53	8	LNUM	LS	4	5	Qwest indicates this is a sequential number beginning with one (1). This should not cause an impact.	N
	9	LNUM	LSNP	4	5		
	8	LNUM	NP	4	5		
	9	LNUM	RS	4	5		
	30	LNUM	CRS	4	5		
54	109	LOCNUM	RPL	4	3	Qwest defines this field as having a maximum of two (2) characters. This should not have an impact.	N
55	5	LQTY	LS	4	3	This could have an impact.	Y
	5	LQTY	LSNP	4	3		
56	45	LTC	CRS	4	2	This could have an impact.	Y
57	8	NAME	EU	60	25	This could have an impact.	Y
58	6	ORD	RS	10	20	Since Qwest assigns this number, it should not cause an impact.	N
59	76	PLTN	DL	12	20	This should not have an impact.	N

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
60	14	PORTED#	NP	17	12	This could have an impact.	Y
61	31	REMARKS	DRS	255	160	Since the REMARKS are determined by the CLEC, this should not cause an impact	N
	34	REMARKS	NP	255	160		
	40	REMARKS	LS	255	160		
	53	REMARKS	LSNP	255	160		
	63	REMARKS	EU	255	160		
	113	REMARKS	DL	255	160		
	73	REMARKS	DSR	255	160		
	91	REMARKS	RPL	255	160		
108	REMARKS	LSR	255	160			
62	47	ROOM/MAILSTOP	EU	15	10	This could have an impact.	Y
	81	ROOM/MAILSTOP	RPL	15	10		
63	52	RORD	LSR	10	20	Since this is a Qwest provided number, it should not have an impact	N
64	3	RSQTY	CRS	3	5	This could have an impact.	Y
	5	RSQTY	RPL	3	5		
65	11	SANO	EU	8	10	This could have an impact.	Y
	13	SANO	RPL	8	10		
	47	SANO	RPL	8	10		
66	10	SAPR	EU	5	6	This could have an impact.	Y
	12	SAPR	RPL	5	6		
	46	SAPR	RPL	5	6		
67	14	SASN	EU	50	60	This could have an impact.	Y
	16	SASN	RPL	50	60		
	50	SASN	RPL	50	60		
68	16	SASS	EU	4	2	Qwest uses the directional abbreviations provided in LSOG. This should not cause an impact.	N
	18	SASS	RPL	4	2		
	52	SASS	RPL	4	2		
69	15	SATH	EU	10	7	This could have an	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
	17	SATH	RPL	10	7	impact.	
	51	SATH	RPL	10	7		
70	21	SUP	LSR	2	1	This could have an impact.	Y
71	32	TCOPT	LS	1	3	Although the field is defined in LSOG as three (3) characters, the valid values are only one (1) character in length. This should not have an impact	N
	45	TCOPT	LSNP	1	3		
	35	TCOPT	RS	1	3		
72	62	TCPER	EU	8	10	LSOG allows for two (2) pre-printed hyphens. As dashes are not allowed in the EDI Date format, the Qwest usage of eight (8) characters as the field length should not cause an impact.	N
	37	TCPER	LS	8	10		
	50	TCPER	LSNP	8	10		
	31	TCPER	NP	8	10		
	40	TCPER	RS	8	10		
73	36	TERS	CRS	4	10	This could have an impact.	Y
	18	TERS	RS	4	10		
74	115	TLI	LSR	12	14	This should not have an impact.	N
75	14	TNS	RS	12	17	This should not have an impact.	N
	32	TNS	CRS	12	17		
76	100	ZIPCODE	DL	5	12	This could have an	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
	26	ZIPCODE	EU	5	12	impact.	
	50	ZIPCODE	EU	5	12		
	29	ZIPCODE	RPL	5	12		
	63	ZIPCODE	RPL	5	12		
	84	ZIPCODE	RPL	5	12		

4.2.3.1. Analysis of Data Integration Issues

Table 4.23 identifies the total number of data fields with perceived integration issues.



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.23 -Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number Non-Impacting	% of Non-Impacting	Total Number Impacting	% of Impacting	Total Number of Integration Issues	% of Total
Generic Integration Issues	1	3%	1	3%	2	3%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to Qwest)	2	5%	7	19%	9	12%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to LSOG)	36	92%	29	78%	65	86%
Total Number of Integration Issues	39		37		76	

Note: The ten (10) Data Fields on the Qwest-to-Qwest listing are also present on the Qwest-to-LSOG listing.

Table 4.24 compares the percentage of data fields with perceived integration issues against the “Total Number of Data Fields Used by Qwest” in Table 4.18.

Table 4.24 -Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of Non-Impacting Data Integration Issues	39	15%
Number of Impacting Data Integration Issues	37	15%
Total Number of Data Integration Issues	76	30%
Total Number of Used Data Fields	255	

Note: If the ten (10) fields that appear in both the Qwest-to-Qwest and Qwest-to-LSOG listings of field length variations are only counted once, instead of twice, the percentage of “Total Number of Data Integration Issues” compared to the “Total Number of Used Data Fields” becomes 26 percent.

4.2.3.2. Analysis of Order Integration

Table 4.25 illustrates the number of pre-order fields that can be used across multiple order forms. For example, Qwest returns the COMPTIME to the CLEC on the AAR. CLECs can subsequently use this data on the LSR form in the APPTIME field. When Qwest returns the COMPDATE field on the AAR, the CLEC must be able to integrate this data into its internal application systems in order to re-use the data on the LSR form.



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.25 - Order Data Field Integration

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of fields used Pre-Order to Order	114	2%
Total Number of Data Fields Across All Order Forms	5499	

4.3. Post-Order

This section compares Qwest's post-order forms to the LSOG 5 standard post-order forms.

4.3.1. Post-Order Document Descriptions

Table 4.26 identifies the Post-Order query and response documents used in MTP Test 12, and cross-references them with the corresponding LSOG 5 form. HPC considered any form Qwest used that was not part of LSOG 5 to be a non-standard form. Table 4.26 identifies those forms as Completion, LSR Status Query, and Status Change.

Table 4.26 – Post-Order Forms

Document Description	Qwest Form	LSOG Form	Standard or Non Standard Form
Completion	CN		Non-Standard
Jeopardy (includes Non-Fatal, Fatal)	JEOP	LSC	Standard
LSR Status Query / Response	LSRSQ/LSRSR		Non-Standard
Order FOC and Supplemental	FOC	LSC	Standard
Status Change Inquiry- Auto Push	SU		Non-Standard

4.3.2. Post-Order Field Statistics

HPC first looked at the available post-order fields as a whole, and then reviewed them on a form-by-form basis.

Once the Data Field compilation was complete, HPC further analyzed whether Qwest included the field on a form, and whether Qwest used the field. Qwest's Disclosure Document defines Field Usage as "Required," "Conditional," "Optional," "Not Used," or "Prohibited." HPC identified only those fields that Qwest identifies as "Required," "Conditional," or "Optional" as Qwest-utilized.

In Table 4.27, HPC calculated the total number of post-order data fields based on the number of LSOG fields and Qwest-specific data fields. HPC identified Qwest-specific data fields as any post-order data field that was not included in LSOG 5.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.27 – Post-Order Data Field Statistics

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	102	66%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	52	34%
Total Number of Data Fields	154	

Table 4.28 indicates how many of the “Total Number of Data Fields” in Table 4.27 are included in the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document for post-order processing.

Table 4.28 - Post-Order Data Field Inclusion by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Included	% of Total Included
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Included	52	34%	52	34%
LSOG Data Fields – Included	102	66%	102	66%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Included	0	0%		
Total Number of Included Data Fields	154		154	

Table 4.29 indicates how many of the “Total Number of Included Data Fields” in Table 4.28 are used in the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document for post-order processing.

Table 4.29 - Post-Order Data Field Usage by Qwest

Description	Total Number	% of Total	Total Number Used	% of Total Used
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Used	52	34%	52	51%
Qwest Specific Data Fields – Not Used	0	0%		
LSOG Data Fields – Used	49	32%	49	49%
LSOG Data Fields – Not Used	53	34%		
Total Number of Used Data Fields	154		101	



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.30 identifies the number of times each data field is used across all of the Qwest post-order forms. This analysis specifies which are Qwest-specific fields and which are LSOG fields.

Table 4.30 – Total Number of Post-Order Data Fields across all Forms

Description	Total Number	% of Total
LSOG Data Fields	168	72%
Qwest-Specific Data Fields	66	28%
Total Number of Data Fields	234	

4.3.3. Data Integration Issues

After reviewing the Qwest IMA EDI Disclosure Document, HPC encountered various issues that could impact a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. These issues are classified into the three categories below:

- Generic Integration Issues (Table 4.31);
- Field Length Variations Across Qwest Pre-Order Forms (Table 4.32);
- Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG (Table 4.33).

The tables classify each issue's perceived impact on a CLEC's ability to integrate its internal systems. Only fields used by Qwest are included in the tables.

Table 4.31 – Generic Integration Issues

Issue #	Qwest Field Number	Field Name	Form	Issue	Impact
1	5	D/TSENT	CN	In the Completion, Qwest lists C/TSENT as C/TSENT.	N

Table 4.32 – Field Length Variations Across Qwest Post-Order Forms

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
2	DRTI	29	CN	4	The Qwest business rules indicate that this field is returned from the product specific forms. On the DRS, the field length is four (4). This should not be an issue.	N
		66f	FOC	10		
3	ORD	8	CN	10	The CN indicates that this field is obtained from the FOC. This could	Y
		50c	FOC	20		

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	Field Name	Qwest Field Number	Forms	Qwest Field Length	Issue	Impact
		10	LSRSQ	10	impact integration.	
		12	JEP	10		
4	ORDNUM	6	CN	3	This should not cause an impact.	N
		54a	FOC	3		
		17	LSRSR	10		
		10	SU	10		
5	TELNO	15	FOC	12	This should not cause an impact.	N
		33	FOC	17		
6	TLI	16a	CN	14	This should not cause an impact.	N
		66a	FOC	12		

Table 4.33 – Field Length Variations Between Qwest and LSOG

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
7	4	AN	FOC	16	20	This should not have an impact.	N
8	23	BAN1	FOC	16	13	This could have an impact.	Y
9	25	BAN2	FOC	16	13	This could have an impact.	Y
10	61	CFA	FOC	54	42	Qwest defines the length of the CFA as 42. This should not have an impact.	N
11	59	CKR	FOC	36	41	Qwest defines its circuits with a length of 20 characters. The CKR can also be a range. This could have an impact.	Y
12	11	D/TSENT	FOC	12	17	This should not have an impact.	N
13	60	ISPID	FOC	15	14	This could have an impact.	Y

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Issue #	LSOG Field Number	Field Name	Form	Qwest Field Length	LSOG Field Length	Issue	Impact
14	6	LSRNO	FOC	11	18	This should not have an impact.	N
15	7	ORD	JEP	10	20	This should not have an impact.	N
16	82	RECCKT	FOC	24	41	This should not have an impact.	N
17	107	REMARKS	FOC	500	160	This could have an impact.	Y
	107	REMARKS	JEP	500	160		
18	33	TELNO	FOC	17	12	This could have an impact.	Y
19	57	TERS	FOC	4	10	This should not have an impact.	N
20	56	TNS	FOC	12	17	This should not have an impact.	N

4.3.3.1. Analysis of Data Integration Issues

Table 4.34 indicates the total number of post-order data fields with perceived integration issues.

Table 4.34 – Post-Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number Non-Impacting	% of Non-Impacting	Total Number Impacting	% of Impacting	Total Number of Integration Issues	% of Total
Generic Integration Issues	1	8%	0	0%	1	5%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to Qwest)	4	31%	1	14%	5	25%
Data Fields with Variations in Length – (Qwest to LSOG)	8	62%	6	86%	14	70%
Total Number of Integration Issues	13		7		20	

Note: The three (3) Data Fields on the Qwest-to-Qwest listing are also present on the Qwest-to-LSOG listing.

Table 4.35 indicates the percentage of data fields with perceived integration issues against the “Total Number of Data Fields Used by Qwest” in Table 4.29.



Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

Table 4.35 – Post-Order Data Integration Issues

Description	Total Number	% of Total
Number of Non-Impacting Data Integration Issues	13	13%
Number of Impacting Data Integration Issues	7	7%
Total Number of Data Integration Issues	20	20%
Total Number of Utilized Data Fields	101	

Note: If the three (3) fields that appear in both the Qwest-to-Qwest and Qwest-to-LSOG listing of field length variations are only counted once, the percentage of "Total Number of Data Integration Issues" compared to the "Total Number of Used Data Fields" becomes 17 percent.

Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential



5. Summary of Findings

The integration process is highly dependent on the internal application system(s), EDI translator, telecom expertise and integration experience of the CLEC. With that stated, HPC does not feel that are any issues that would prohibit a CLEC from integrating Qwest data with their internal application system(s). This does not mean that there are not issues that would have to be resolved between Qwest and the CLEC, but simply that these issues are not insurmountable.