

## Appendices A, B, and C

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



# 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, 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 location 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 sent out a corrected Qwest Product announcement to the CLEC community.   | Qwest consolidated several web sites to make it easier for CLECs. Qwest implemented changes 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 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*



# 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.<br>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*

Release Date: 4/19/02  
 Appendix HP-A  
 For Qwest, Regional Oversight Committee, Hewlett-Packard Consulting,  
 KPMG Consulting, and MTG use only.

"Proprietary Information - Not for public release without the prior written consent of Hewlett Packard Consulting and the ROC."



invent

# 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*





invent

# 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*



# 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*



# HP Observations and Exceptions

| Number   | Summary   | Qwest Resolution  | HP Action and Disposition  |
|----------|---|---|--|
| OBS 2052 | Qwest did not provide a response to an UDF IRJ 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, SUPPED the order via IMA EDI, and Qwest did not process the SUPP.  | Qwest indicated that it did not receive the transaction.<br>Qwest maintained that the order was not received.  | HP noted that according to its Interactive Agent (IA) logs, the SUPP was received.<br>As mutually agreed by the parties, HP recommended that this transaction be marked as "CLOSED – INCONCLUSIVE."<br>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*



# 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 retrofitted 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*



# 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



invent

# 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 DSI business customer to CLEC UNE DSI 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.<br>HP verified the update and retested unsuccessfully (one failed instance of four).<br>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*



# 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-CLEC 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 CLEC 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

| 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*



# 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 SOCs. | 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

invent

| 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 retained 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 implemented 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*



# 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 SOCs 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



invent

# 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"> <li>unresponsive to trouble tickets,</li> <li>un knowledgeable on certain basic issues,</li> <li>providing conflicting status on P-CLEC orders, and</li> <li>providing conflicting referrals from Center personnel to other Qwest resources.</li> </ul> | 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*





# 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 DLRQs 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 FBDL order requires the "SCD" (Service Completion Date) field.  | Qwest updated its IMA EDI Disclosure Documentation, I-Charts, LSOG, and IMA FBDL 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 SOCs. 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*

**HP Consulting**

---

**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

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

## 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*



# 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**

| <b>Products and Transactions</b> | <b>Type</b> |
|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 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*



# Pre-Order/Order Integration Field Comparison Report

## 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          |            |



# 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<br>CSRR-72<br>CSRR-82<br>CSRR-88<br>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<br>CSRR-72<br>CSRR-82<br>CSRR-88<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>AVR<br>CSRR<br>FAQ<br>RLDQ<br>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<br>AVR<br>CSRQ<br>CSRR<br>FAQ<br>RLDQ<br>RLDR<br>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<br>ASR<br>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<br>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<br>CTQ<br>TNSQ  | 2<br>6<br>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<br>AVR<br>CSRQ<br>CSRR<br>FAQ<br>RLDQ<br>RLDR<br>TNAQ | 15                                    | 9                 | Since the Qwest field is longer, this could impact integration.                             | Y      |
| 25      | 20                | SALOC      | AVQ<br>AVR<br>CSRQ<br>CSRR<br>FAQ<br>RLDQ<br>RLDR<br>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<br>AVR<br>CSRQ<br>CSRR<br>FAQ<br>RLDQ<br>RLDR<br>TNAQ | 4                                     | 5                 | Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.                               | Y      |
| 28      | 22                | SAZC       | AVQ<br>AVR<br>CSRQ<br>CSRR<br>FAQ<br>RLDQ<br>RLDR<br>TNAQ | 5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>10<br>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<br>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<br>60           | FEATURE<br>DETAIL | CRS<br>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<br>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.<br>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                 |   |        |
|         |            | 11                 | JEP   | 10                 |   |        |
| 5       | ORDNUM     | 6                  | CN    | 3                  | This should not cause an impact.  | N      |
|         |            | 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<br>in the format<br>"/"FFID"space"FFID<br>DATA. Do not map<br>FFID = PIC, LPIC,<br>or TN. |             |            |
| Cust Svc | FFIDDATA   |             |            | FEATUREDETAIL<br>in the format<br>"/"FFID"space"FFID<br>DATA. Do not map<br>FFID= PIC, LPIC,<br>or TN.  |             |            |



## 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 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

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

## 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*



# 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 |





# 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*

| <b>Term</b> | <b>Definition</b>                         |
|-------------|---|
| 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*

| <b>Documentation</b>   | <b>Issued By</b>  |
|--|---|
| 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.                                |

*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 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          |            |



# 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<br>CSRR-73<br>CSRR-83<br>CSRR-89<br>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<br>CSRR-73<br>CSRR-83<br>CSRR-89<br>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<br>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.<br><br>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<br>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<br>AVR<br>FAQ<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>AVR<br>FAQ<br>TNAQ | 8                  | 10                | Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.       | Y      |
| 28      | 14                | SAPR       | AVQ<br>AVR<br>FAQ<br>TNAQ | 4                  | 6                 | Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.       | Y      |
| 29      | 19                | SASN       | AVQ<br>AVR<br>FAQ<br>TNAQ | 50                 | 60                | Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.       | Y      |
| 30      | 21                | SASS       | AVQ<br>AVR<br>FAQ<br>TNAQ | 4                  | 5                 | Since the Qwest field is shorter, this could cause an impact.       | Y      |
| 31      | 20                | SATH       | AVQ<br>AVR<br>FAQ<br>TNAQ | 10                 | 7                 | Since the Qwest field is longer, this could cause an impact.        | Y      |
| 32      | 32                | TNRES      | CTQ<br>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<br>AVQ<br>AVR<br>FAQ  | 12                 | 10                | Since the Qwest field is longer, this could cause an impact.        | Y      |
| 35      | 31                | ZIP        | AVQ<br>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<br>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.

**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).



# 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<br>60           | FEATURE<br>DETAIL | CRS<br>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<br>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.



# 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               |                 |

*Published by Hewlett-Packard – Confidential*



# 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 impact integration.   | 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.



## 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.