

0001

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 QWEST OSS 271 VENDOR TECHNICAL CONFERENCE

12 3989 S. Teller, Quad 112

13 Lakewood, Colorado

14 Monday, March 4, 2002

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

0002

1 APPEARANCES:

2 AT&T

JOHN FINNEGAN

3 MARY TRIBBY

TIM CONNOLLY

4

COLORADO COMMISSION

5 BRUCE SMITH

WENDIE ALLSTOT

6

HPC

7 DON PETRY

GEOFFREY A. MAY

8 JEFFREY W. CROCKETT

LIZ GRAGERT

9 MARY CEGELSKI

TRICIA PARKER

10 LEE TRUDEAU

11 KPMG

BEN HEMPHILL

12 BRADLEY R. STUBER

CARRIE THIELEMANN

13 CHUCK WOLVERTON

FOLAKE FABUNMI

14 JOE DELLATORRE

JOHN DEAHL

15 JULIANA A. BARTRA

LIZ FUCCILLO
16 MICHAEL BUJAN
MIKE WEEKS
17 NOLAN DINSMORE
RUSS GUZDAR
18 SHUN YEUNG
TOBIAS D. SCHWARTZ
19 TODD M. KONERSMANN
BRIAN T. RUTTER
20 STEPHEN SESKO
21 MONTANA COMMISSION
KATE WHITNEY
22
MTG
23 ROBERT M. CENTER
DENISE ANDERSON
24 MARIE BAKUNAS
25
0003
1 APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2 NEBRASKA COMMISSION
BUSTER GRIFFING
3
NEW MEXICO COMMISSION
4 ANTHONY MEDEIROS
5 OREGON COMMISSION
IRV EMMONS
6
QWEST
7 ANDY CRAIN
BARB BROHL
8 CHERIE AXLEROD
CHRIS VIVEROS
9 GARY WOODSIDE
JACKIE DONALDSON
10 KRISTIN PROVOST
LUCY HIGLEY
11 LYNN NOTARIANNI
MIKE WILLIAMS
12 NANCY LUBAMERSKY
PAT HALBACH
13 SCOTT SIMANSON
TOM KOWAL
14 RON L. TRULLINGER
NITA TAYLOR
15 SHEILA BOTEIN
16 WASHINGTON COMMISSION
DAVE GRIFFITH
17 TOM SPINKS
18 WORLDCOM
LIZ BALVIN
19 TOM DIXON
TOM PRIDAY
20

21
22
23
24
25
0004

P R O C E E D I N G S

1 MS. ANDERSON: Welcome. I hope you're all
2 here for the vendor technical conference number 1 for
3 the ROC OSS test. I'm Denise Anderson and we're
4 apologizing for the wrong conference bridge typo code
5 there. We'll get going, though. Several people have
6 called and two or three people are sending out
7 E-mails to the TAG with the corrected code. So we'll
8 give them a minute and get going.

9
10 Mike Weeks and I were laughing earlier. I
11 said, it seems pretty organized so far, so we've had
12 our major snafu with the typo in the bridge number so
13 we'll get past that and hopefully it will be
14 relatively smooth sailing. We've got a lot of
15 questions to address here.

16 I'm Denise Anderson with MTG. MTG is a
17 project manager, as most of you know. There are a
18 few new faces and so I'm just trying to bring
19 everyone to common ground. Next to me is Bob Center
20 also with MTG. And Marie is the person running
21 around taking care of logistics. Marie Bakunas also
22 with MTG.

23 I would like to talk just a few minutes
24 about logistics and then we'll hop into this thing.
25 In terms of the agenda, you have that agenda, we put

0005

1 the agenda together with relative amounts of time
2 laid out according to the number of questions
3 received. And so we'll try to stay with those but
4 we'll probably have to modify as we go through
5 things.

6 There is going to be a sign-in sheet being
7 passed around. This one right here. If you'll
8 please just initial yourself. If you don't find
9 yourself on that list, add yourself at the end.
10 We'll quickly go through the room here with people
11 saying who they are and their company affiliation and
12 then we'll move to the bridge just so everyone knows
13 kind of who the universe of people that's attending
14 is.

15 We're going to be taking a break in the
16 morning each day and we'll have an hour for lunch and
17 you're on your own for lunch. There is a nice
18 breakfast at the back which you've already found and
19 there will be a cafeteria available at lunchtime.
20 We'll get more details on that as we get closer. We
21 expect to break around 5:15 today. KPMG has
22 distributed a consolidated set of questions. Thank

23 you for doing that. And thank you to the parties for
24 putting in the questions. We had questions submitted
25 by AT&T and Worldcom and also by Washington state

0006

1 staff.

2 This conference is being transcribed by
3 Mary Grace and she is going to require that whenever
4 you're speaking that you state your name and company
5 so that she can have that in here. And you yell if
6 you need us to stop for any reason whatsoever.

7 We're going to take a few minutes right
8 now to go around the room. As I said, Denise
9 Anderson, MTG.

10 MR. CENTER: Bob Center, MTG.

11 MR. PETRY: Don Petry, HPC.

12 MR. MAY: Geoff May, HP.

13 MR. CROCKETT: Jeff Crockett with the law
14 firm of Snell & Wilmer, outside counsel to HP.

15 MS. ANDERSON: Before we go any further,
16 folks on the bridge, are you hearing this?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's getting weaker
18 but yes, we can hear it.

19 MS. ANDERSON: Speak up.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: John Finnegan, AT&T.

21 MS. TRIBBY: Mary Tribby, AT&T.

22 MR. DIXON: Tom Dixon, Worldcom.

23 MS. BALVIN: Liz Balvin, Worldcom.

24 MR. PRIDAY: Tom Priday, Worldcom.

25 MR. CONNOLLY: Jim Connolly, AT&T.

0007

1 MR. TRUDEAU: Lee Trudeau, HPC.

2 MR. SIMANSON: Scott Simanson, HP.

3 MS. CEGELSKI: Mary Cegelski, HPC.

4 MS. GRAGERT: Liz Gragert, HPC.

5 MS. PARKER: Tricia Parker, HPC.

6 MS. BROHL: Barbara Brohl, Qwest.

7 MR. VIVEROS: Chris Viveros, Qwest.

8 MR. KONERSMANN: Todd Konersmann, KPMG.

9 MR. BUJAN: Michael Bujan, KPMG.

10 MR. RUTTER: Brian Rutter, KPMG.

11 MR. MEDEIROS: Anthony Medeiros, advisory
12 staff, New Mexico Commission.

13 MS. FABUNMI: Folake Fabunmi.

14 MS. HIGLEY: Lucy Higley, Qwest.

15 MR. EMMONS: Irv Emmons, Oregon Public
16 Utility Commission.

17 MR. TRULLINGER: Ron Trullinger, Qwest.

18 MR. SPINKS: Tom Spinks, Washington
19 Commission.

20 MR. GRIFFITH: David Griffith, Washington
21 Commission.

22 MS. WHITNEY: Kate Whitney, Montana
23 Commission.

24 MS. ALLSTOT: Wendie Allstot, Colorado

25 Commission.

0008

1 MS. LUBAMERSKY: Nancy Lubamersky, Qwest.
2 MS. NOTARIANNI: Lynn Notarianni, Qwest.
3 MR. CRAIN: Andy Crain, Qwest.
4 MR. TAYLOR: Peter Taylor, Qwest.
5 MR. HEMPHILL: Ben Hemphill, KPMG.
6 MR. YEUNG: Shun Yeung, KPMG.
7 MR. SCHWARTZ: Tobias D. Schwartz, KPMG.
8 MR. SMITH: Bruce Smith, Colorado

9 Commission.

10 MR. STRIGHT: Bob Stright.
11 MR. GRIFFING: Buster Griffing, Nebraska

12 Commission.

13 MS. PROVOST: Kristin Provost, Qwest.
14 MS. BOTEIN: Sheila Botein, Qwest.
15 MR. WOODSIDE: Gary Woodside, Qwest.
16 MR. WILLIAMS: Mike Williams, Qwest.
17 MS. DONALDSON: Jackie Donaldson, Qwest.
18 MS. AXLEROD: Cherie Axlerod, Qwest.
19 MR. SIMANSON: Scott Simanson, Qwest.
20 MS. ANDERSON: Let's go to the bridge.

21 We've got -- I'm just holding off on KPMG because I
22 know you guys will want to introduce your folks.
23 Let's go to the bridge. I know who requested ports
24 and I'll just run down those quickly. Idaho?

25 MR. HART: Wayne Hart.

0009

1 MS. ANDERSON: Minnesota PUC?
2 MR. SMITH: Ray Smith.
3 MS. WELLS: Diane Wells.
4 MS. EGBERT: Peggy Egbert for Utah.
5 MS. ANDERSON: Montana?
6 MS. GILLESPIE: Cheryl Gillespie with
7 Qwest in Montana.
8 MS. ANDERSON: Nebraska, heard Dick
9 already. Dick, anyone there with you?
10 MR. PALAZZALO: No, just me.
11 MS. ANDERSON: Oregon? South Dakota?
12 MR. BEST: Harlan Best.
13 MS. ANDERSON: Washington?
14 MS. BEATON: Rebecca Beaton, Washington
15 staff.

16 MS. ANDERSON: Wyoming?
17 MR. KORBER: Mike Korber for the Wyoming
18 Commission.

19 MR. MAGNOLDI: And Mike Magnoldi with
20 Qwest.

21 MS. ANDERSON: Minnesota Department of
22 Commerce? I think there is HP on the bridge. Qwest
23 on the bridge.

24 MS. HAILE: This is Kathy Haile with
25 Qwest.

0010

1 MR. HALBACH: This is Pat Halbach, Qwest.
2 MR. TELEDONAS: Gabe Teledonas, Qwest,
3 Nebraska.
4 MS. ANDERSON: Any other Qwest people on
5 the bridge? Worldcom on the bridge? Department of
6 Justice on the bridge?
7 MS. HUNDLY: Joyce Hundly.
8 MS. ANDERSON: Iowa on the bridge?
9 MR. ROSAUER: Nick Rosauer.
10 MS. BAKER: Penny Baker.
11 MS. ANDERSON: And I think there is a
12 bunch of KPMG folks on the bridge. Can you identify
13 yourself, please, KPMG folks on the bridge?
14 MR. WOODHOUSE: Rick Woodhouse, KPMG
15 Consulting.
16 MR. BLACK: Chris Black, KPMG Consulting.
17 MS. ANDERSON: Any others?
18 MS. PADGIOTIS: Nick Padgiotis, KPMG
19 Consulting.
20 MS. ANDERSON: Anyone else that we haven't
21 gotten that's on the bridge?
22 MS. ZENGER: Joni Zenger, Utah Division of
23 Public Utilities.
24 MS. ANDERSON: Hi, Joni. Anyone else?
25 Okay. Let's proceed. Just to quickly review the
0011

1 purpose of today, our objective here is to answer
2 questions on the designated discrete reports
3 concerning the facts about the general scope,
4 approach and findings. It is to provide information
5 on the facts. Somewhere around here Marie has this
6 little thing, a picture of Joe Friday with just the
7 facts. That's what we're trying to do here today.
8 So just to balance things, we are not here to argue
9 over the results, findings or scope at this point, to
10 disagree with the test. This is not for advocacy.

11 So KPMG will be moving through the
12 questions. I'm going to turn it over to them in just
13 a moment. You've got the consolidated list of
14 questions. If you don't get a copy, I think there is
15 a few copies up here. Does anyone need a copy before
16 we get going? For people on the bridge, that was
17 distributed to the TAG Friday, I believe.

18 In terms of process, we're going to be
19 moving through those. KPMG will answer follow-up
20 questions if they can. If not, they will make
21 arrangements to do so later in writing. Any
22 questions before we begin? One announcement.
23 Actually, two. The facilities are just out that door
24 and the AV people are still working on the
25 microphones so hopefully it will improve as they

0012

1 continue to work.

2 With that, I would like to turn it over to

3 Joe DellaTorre -- Mike Weeks and Joe DellaTorre with
4 KPMG Consulting.

5 MR. WEEKS: Thanks, Denise. I would like
6 to add my welcome to the group both here and on the
7 bridge. I think there were a lot of really good
8 questions asked. We appreciate the opportunity to
9 clarify or amplify on what's in the report. As a
10 matter of reminder to folks, I'll let everybody
11 remember that these are still draft reports and
12 they're still subject to change.

13 So this isn't necessarily the final word
14 on anything but we did want to present this
15 opportunity to go through the discrete reports that
16 are out there. There may be additional testing that
17 would cause something in these reports to change.
18 May not be. We're constantly reviewing these things
19 ourselves and checking the facts and some of the
20 questions that we're asked have stimulated us to
21 think a little bit harder about a couple of areas.

22 So we may be doing some more wordsmithing,
23 we may be doing some more moving things around, so
24 that's just the nature of the draft process. And so
25 it's a good news/bad news. The good news is we get

0013

1 to have these conversations early. The bad news is
2 some of the stuff may kind of wiggle on you between
3 now and the draft final report. But you'll always be
4 able to tell what the differences are from release to
5 release as we go through these reports.

6 So I would suspect that when we have the
7 second vendor technical conference, if there is
8 anything that's substantial that we need to bring to
9 your attention that may be material in nature that's
10 changed since this conference, we'll do that. It was
11 just wordsmithing here and there. That will be
12 obvious in the Word documents.

13 The other thing that I would like to add
14 is that we're going to kind of give a brief summary,
15 if you will, of each question. We're not going to
16 read each question word for word verbatim. If in our
17 summaries we misstate the question in your mind,
18 please say, no, that's not what we asked, because we
19 sort of -- it's the problem with written
20 communication. We're not always sure exactly what
21 you're asking or what you meant. So if in our
22 summary of the question, we don't capture the essence
23 of it, make sure that you correct us on that.

24 We're also in each area going to kind of
25 use the pattern of Joe and/or I will kind of read the

0014

1 question and sort of give the answer. Our colleagues
2 that are sitting behind us, who Joe will introduce in
3 a minute, were the folks that prepared these reports.
4 If we need to, we will caucus with them and make sure

5 we get a really good answer for you to the question
6 that you've asked us.

7 Also, we've had a request to kind of give
8 a sort of real high level sort of where are we in
9 this test kind of summary and we'll do that at the
10 beginning of each of the reports. So we're going to
11 start with 12.7, the loop qual, and sort of where we
12 are there is there were fundamentally 10 evaluation
13 criteria that are all sitting at this point in a
14 state of satisfied --

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Before we get into
16 that, the acoustics are just terrible. We're having
17 trouble, there is a lot of background and your voice
18 is fading in and out. It's very difficult to catch
19 every other word.

20 MR. WEEKS: Okay. We have the AV people
21 working on the sound.

22 (Pause.)

23 MR. WEEKS: The 12.7 loop qual has
24 fundamentally 10 evaluation criteria that are sitting
25 out there. They're all currently sitting in a

0015

1 satisfied state. I'll give my normal speech that I
2 always give. Not all evaluation criteria are
3 weighted equally. Playing the numbers game of
4 counting up sats and not sats and all that stuff is a
5 very dangerous thing to do and I would encourage you
6 not to do that.

7 We could find ourselves in a situation at
8 the end of this test where we have one not satisfied
9 in the entire report and could kill competition. We
10 could have the situation in this report where we had
11 25 not sats and everything is just fine. So I resist
12 the temptation to play the numbers game but just so
13 you can kind of get a feel for where we are on this
14 test, we're done with this test. If things need to
15 be opened back up, if Qwest changes processes, we may
16 go back and revisit some of these areas, but we're
17 fundamentally wrapped up on this and at this point,
18 I'm going to turn it over to Joe and let him go
19 through the questions and answers and so on for 12.7.

20 MR. DELLATORRE: Good morning. First, I
21 wanted to introduce the folks that are behind me.
22 Liz Fuccillo is a member of the jurisdiction team.
23 Juliana Bartra is the OM project manager. Brad
24 Stuber is the process test lead. Steve Sesko, right
25 behind me, is the order management domain lead.

0016

1 Chuck Wolverton is the OM process test manager. And
2 Carrie Thielemann is also with me on the jurisdiction
3 team. So I'm sure that most of you have come to know
4 Carrie and myself well from most of my calls.

5 I'm going to make an attempt to put this
6 down and speak. I don't think I have much trouble

7 projecting typically so I would rather not be holding
8 that because I'll be shuffling papers. My intention
9 is to run through the questions. These reports have
10 been out there for some time. I think everyone has
11 had the opportunity to read them probably thoroughly
12 and, therefore, I'm not going to review what that
13 section of the task is about. I think we all know.
14 The loop qualification process evaluation.

15 Let's go into the Washington state staff
16 questions. The staff submitted four questions which
17 apply to all of our tasks, all of our domains, but we
18 will handle them individually within each test. For
19 the first test, the question -- and sometimes I'll
20 read the question but often I'll just try to cut to
21 the heart of what the question is asking. For each
22 OSS testing reports to be reviewed, what were the
23 Washington state specific or Western region
24 statistical testing results? The same answer will
25 apply to all the states and regions for this

0017

1 particular test. There was no distinction made by
2 state or region in this process evaluation.

3 The second question was a request to
4 discuss open Os and Es or unresolved observations and
5 exceptions or test areas. And in this case, there
6 were none. There were none in the not satisfied
7 state, none open, unresolved. However, there is one
8 HPC observation that is 2078 that remains open at
9 this time. And there is a relationship between 2078
10 and test 12.7. I encourage anyone who would like
11 further information on that to refer to the O&E log.

12 Question number 3. Identify any material
13 revisions made to the initial test reports and
14 explain why. Our intention -- we are currently
15 drafting a change report that will highlight changes
16 that were made from one version of the discrete
17 report to another as well as explaining or
18 identifying the underlying impetus for the change.
19 We hope to have the first version of that out a week
20 from today. So we will try to cover both what was
21 changed and why those changes were made in a change
22 log.

23 And question number 4, not unlike question
24 number 2 with open unresolveds, a different flavor of
25 it. It was inquiring about any unable to determines

0018

1 for evaluation criteria within this report, and there
2 were none of those as well. That covers the
3 Washington state questions. We'll go through those
4 same questions for each report.

5 Any other questions, follow-up questions
6 to those? Okay, good. Let's jump right in.

7 We'll start with the AT&T questions for
8 test 12.7. The first question, explain the ways that

9 KPMG Consulting investigated whether there are
10 additional loop qualification capabilities available
11 to Qwest retail representatives as compared to CLECs.
12 And our method of investigation is highlighted in
13 section 2.4 of the evaluation measures. We reviewed
14 documentation, interviewed personnel, made
15 observations at Qwest's hotel and retail centers and
16 conducted interviews and observations with CLECs,
17 which is highlighted in section 2.4.

18 The second question. Did remedial options
19 that KPMG Consulting investigated include database
20 information on spare facilities? And in section
21 2.1.3 on page 3, we explained that, yes, in fact we
22 did examine that and yes, in fact, remedial options
23 do exist.

24 Question number 3 --

25 MR. FINNEGAN: Joe, could I ask a

0019

1 clarifying question, please?

2 MR. DELLATORRE: Sure.

3 MR. FINNEGAN: In footnote 1 on page
4 12.7.1, the remedial options appear to focus on
5 assuming that there was no way for the loop
6 qualification information to have that loop used for
7 a service. The footnote 1 appears to focus on other
8 types of services as the remedial option. As our
9 question, our second question indicated, we're
10 interested in the spare facilities and I'm not sure
11 where on page 12.7.3 there was this spare facility
12 referenced.

13 MR. WEEKS: John, I think we attempted to
14 get at your answer, and may not have succeeded, up on
15 the top of page 4 where we talk about there are other
16 tools that if a loop qual doesn't give you the
17 information you want and you want to go dig a little
18 further into what other options are available to you,
19 we describe some of the other tools that are
20 available to a CLEC or available to retail to go
21 investigate whether there are other facilities that
22 are available. The databases that are used to
23 answer -- the databases you can navigate are used by
24 both the CLECs and retail to go look and see if there
25 are facilities in there.

0020

1 MR. FINNEGAN: And you did in your
2 interviews and observations with CLECs see them use
3 or attempt to use the options that would let them
4 find spare facilities?

5 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes, we did.

6 MR. WEEKS: The answer is yes.

7 MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

8 MR. DELLATORRE: Number 3.

9 MS. TRIBBY: Just to be clear, spare
10 facilities as opposed to just alternative services,

11 correct?

12 MR. WEEKS: Yes, that's correct.

13 MS. TRIBBY: Thanks.

14 MR. DELLATORRE: Do Qwest retail
15 representatives have other database options available
16 where the Q City to QSERV tool indicates a customer's
17 loop does not qualify for DSL services? Following
18 question, are those other options pursued? The
19 answer to the first is yes. So briefly, are there
20 other database options when this is a not qualified
21 condition, and the answer is yes. To the follow-up
22 question, are those other options pursued, the answer
23 is no. And as a footnote, our understanding is that
24 these options are available to both retail and
25 wholesale inquiries.

0021

1 MR. FINNEGAN: One final follow-up. Do
2 you know what specific query or database the CLECs
3 can use to find out spare facilities as alternatives
4 to a loop that may not be DSL capable?

5 MR. WOLVERTON: This is Chuck Wolverton
6 with KPMG Consulting. John, you can pull by address
7 from any of the three calls that we list in this
8 report, the Qwest DSL tool, the ADSL loop tool as
9 well as the raw loop data tool.

10 MR. FINNEGAN: And that will have spare
11 facility information?

12 MR. WOLVERTON: That's correct.

13 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 4 was identify
14 the KPMG Consulting evaluation criteria identified in
15 section 2.5, and there is a quote from our report.
16 This was a recurring theme throughout several
17 sections of the report submitted by different parties
18 so I would like to state upfront that the evaluation
19 criteria that we refer to are the evaluation criteria
20 that are in the report.

21 We created those in advance of testing to
22 establish the conditions and criteria or standards
23 that we were looking for prior to starting the
24 evaluation. So we assembled our list of evaluation
25 criteria for each test and for each process and

0022

1 subprocess with the relevant measures and you'll see
2 the same types of measures come up. We established
3 those criteria in advance and those are the criteria
4 that you see reflected in the report. There may have
5 been some confusion because this came up several
6 times in several different sections of the test.

7 MR. WEEKS: John, did you have something
8 else in mind when you asked that question?

9 MR. FINNEGAN: No. It was a clarifying
10 question and if I understand your response and the
11 report structure generally, when you have the
12 evaluation criteria and results table --

13 MR. WEEKS: Right, section 3.1 in all the
14 reports is fundamentally the table that was a test
15 cross reference and evaluation criteria, the result
16 and relating comments.

17 MR. FINNEGAN: So generally if we want to
18 know the evaluation criteria, it will be found in
19 that 3.1 table with the column evaluation criteria?

20 MR. WEEKS: That's correct. And so that
21 will be the answer -- you asked that on almost every
22 test and that's the answer for all the tests so we'll
23 just answer it this once.

24 MR. FINNEGAN: Great. Thank you.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: Question number 5, AT&T.

0023

1 Does Qwest provide an escalation process for no
2 responses? Quote, no responses, as opposed to no
3 response, in the Qwest DSL qualification tool or the
4 ADSL unbundled loop qualification tool. Our response
5 is that while no formal escalation process exists for
6 the loop qualification process, there of course does
7 exist the general CLEC customer service and
8 escalation process of the help desk and account
9 management.

10 We do have a clarifying question. If
11 AT&T's intention or expectations was referring to
12 remedial options, then remedial options do in fact
13 exist. The auto qualification feature which allows
14 CLECs to establish an automatic query, it will
15 periodically check the loop to determine whether its
16 qualification status has changed, or a facilities
17 based CLEC does have the option of ordering services
18 from Qwest.

19 And finally, does Qwest provide an
20 escalation process for questionable responses in the
21 raw loop data tool? And I would refer you back to
22 the response that I just gave, that while there is no
23 stand alone process, there is the general help
24 process.

25 Follow-up questions? Okay, that was the

0024

1 AT&T section of questions. Let's move on to
2 Worldcom. We attempted to cull out, if you will, the
3 Worldcom questions from the sections of the report.
4 So should they ever be taken out of context or you
5 would like to provide a little more texture to the
6 question, please feel free. And I was directing that
7 question to Liz Balvin of Worldcom.

8 First, please verify the following: CLECs
9 do not have access to the Pinnacle Peak outsourcing
10 firm. There is a reference to section 2.1.1, page 2,
11 which discusses the use of Pinnacle Peak. Our
12 response is, Pinnacle Peak was an outsourcing firm
13 used by Qwest to determine loop characteristics in
14 the event of a, quote, not determined response. And

15 CLECs did not have direct access to Pinnacle Peak but
16 could go through a Qwest intermediary to get to that
17 information. However, Qwest has made recent changes
18 that eliminated the not determined response for both
19 wholesale and retail queries, thereby eliminating the
20 need for this process. Our business process
21 description in the report will be revised to reflect
22 these changes.

23 Second question, please verify the
24 following: Is the "recent changes" field in LFACS
25 real time updates that can be accessed or are these

0025

1 changes a result of the nightly updates? And there
2 are a couple of subtleties here. These are not real
3 time and they're actually triggered -- or one
4 component is a nightly update that happens from the
5 LQDB that then feeds into LFACS on a nightly
6 schedule. It's the other way around. Excuse me.
7 It's LFACS is a nightly update that then feeds to
8 LQDB.

9 Question number 3. And the question is
10 somewhat -- if taken out of context, is what evidence
11 led KPMG to this conclusion. So therefore, if we
12 back up to what the conclusion statement was, and I
13 believe that that conclusion was that IMA is the
14 primary tool used by CLECs to perform loop
15 qualifications, and the evidence that we have are the
16 evaluation methods that were used in terms of
17 observation interviews and document inspections. And
18 just as a point of clarification, IMA does refer to
19 both EDI and GUI.

20 MR. CONNOLLY: Is it a Qwest regular
21 procedure to synchronize the LFACS and LQDB
22 databases?

23 MR. DELLATORRE: That's a nightly process.

24 MR. WEEKS: It's a batch process that's
25 scheduled --

0026

1 MR. WOLVERTON: There is a full
2 synchronization once a month between LFACS and LQDB.

3 MR. CONNOLLY: I thought there was. Thank
4 you.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: And finally, please
6 verify the following: Qwest retail representatives
7 do not have access to this tool. That's the IMA
8 tool, is our presumption. Qwest retail
9 representatives do not use the raw loop data as part
10 of the retail loop qualification process.

11 MS. BALVIN: But do they have access to
12 the raw loop data tool?

13 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes, they do. And I
14 believe that concludes the questions for 12.7 that
15 were submitted in advance.

16 MS. LUBAMERSKY: Nancy Lubamersky from

17 Qwest. Joe, could you take that as a take-back? I'm
18 not sure that retail service reps have access to loop
19 data. Just double-check that?

20 MR. DELLATORRE: Certainly.

21 MR. WARNER: Can I just ask a couple of
22 follow-up questions to make sure I'm clear as well?

23 MR. DELLATORRE: Sure. Go right ahead.

24 MR. WARNER: So just to be clear, so raw
25 loop data tool which is the batch raw loop tool,

0027

1 that's available to CLECs that you mentioned in your
2 report? That pulls information, I think it was the
3 LFACS, every 30 days or is it updated every 30 days,
4 that information, as opposed to nightly?

5 MR. WOLVERTON: It's the LFACS database
6 that is synchronized every 30 days with the LQ loop
7 qual database. And there are nightly updates but a
8 full synchronization occurs once a month.

9 MR. DELLATORRE: And we will confirm as a
10 take-away whether or not retail reps do have access
11 to that.

12 MR. WARNER: One more thing. When CLECs
13 get access to that raw loop data tool, the batch one,
14 it comes to them, you have to go in and pull that
15 information and copy that into some sort of other
16 database and make some changes so it's in a readable
17 fashion? Can you tell me what Qwest's
18 representatives that are looking for that
19 information, what that process or what they did? Did
20 they have to go through similar stuff that CLECs are
21 required in order to do that?

22 MR. WEEKS: I think it was our assertion
23 that retail reps do not use that tool so they
24 wouldn't be going through the same process as CLECs
25 would go through if the CLEC is in fact using that

0028

1 tool.

2 MR. WARNER: So raw loop data is not an
3 IMA query tool?

4 MR. WEEKS: That is correct. If you
5 choose to use a fundamentally batch program, that
6 implies your OSS have some programming in them to
7 assimilate that information and store it in your
8 proprietary formats, whatever that is.

9 MR. WARNER: Thank you.

10 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions on 12.7?

11 MR. CONNOLLY: If I could ask you to turn
12 to figure 12.7-1, please. There is a box there that
13 is labeled F&S. Can you describe that process or the
14 system component, please?

15 MR. WOLVERTON: Can you give us one second
16 as we caucus here, please?

17 MR. CONNOLLY: Certainly.

18 (Pause.)

19 MR. STUBER: F&S stands for Fetch & Stuff
20 and it allows the two systems to exchange
21 information.

22 MR. CONNOLLY: Thank you. Can I ask you
23 now to turn to 12.7-2? There are three boxes on that
24 page that have this Fetch & Stuff prefix, if you
25 will, but two of them are followed with an SIA

0029

1 designation and one other is followed with a DA
2 designation. Can you tell us what those represent?

3 MR. WEEKS: We're going to have to get
4 back to you on the specifics of what distinguishes
5 those from the others. The general purposes are the
6 same but the specifics for what SIA or DA stands for
7 we'll have to follow up on.

8 MR. CONNOLLY: And the next question in
9 follow up to that is, the absence of the additional
10 detail in 12.7-2 contrasted -- full Fetch & Stuff
11 contrasted with the single representation on 12.7-1,
12 is there a material difference between the underlying
13 Fetch & Stuff capabilities which is being accessed by
14 retail and wholesale?

15 MR. WEEKS: Right. To kind of reask that
16 question maybe, the first question would be, is there
17 a fundamental difference in level of detail in 12.7-1
18 versus 12.7-2. One is just a lower level of
19 abstraction than the other. If the answer to that is
20 no, then the question would be -- or specifically the
21 F&S types of capabilities, what's the fundamental
22 difference between retail and wholesale is what
23 you're asking. Understood.

24 MR. CONNOLLY: Very nice synopsis.

25 MR. WEEKS: Thank you. We will follow up

0030

1 on that and get back on that.

2 MR. DELLATORRE: All right. I think we're
3 ready to move on.

4 MS. ANDERSON: At this point, Joe, do you
5 need to reshuffle or is it the same crew back there?

6 MR. DELLATORRE: It will take us a couple
7 of minutes to get papers in order.

8 MR. WEEKS: Yes, there is going to be a
9 lot of paper shuffling noise here for a minute.

10 MS. ANDERSON: I think we're ready to
11 proceed with the next set of questions having to do
12 with 14.7.

13 MR. WEEKS: 14.7 was provisioning process
14 parity evaluation. Just if you're trying to keep
15 track of where we are on this test, 53 evaluation
16 criteria that are currently all sitting in a
17 satisfied state. And as a point of information or
18 clarification that will maybe help set a framework
19 for some of the questions and some of the answers,
20 this provisioning process is a process test and it

21 kind of starts not with ordering, which is where one
22 might think it does, but it actually starts at the
23 point where the order has been successfully stored in
24 SOP, service order processors, and follows it after
25 that.

0031

1 So nothing that has to do with the
2 ordering life cycle is part of the process parity
3 test and what we're trying to do in this test is try
4 and figure out whether wholesale and retail
5 fundamentally, from a process perspective, not from a
6 results or performance perspective, but a process
7 perspective, are the processes in parity with one
8 another, which does not mean identical. It just
9 means same basic functional equivalents. So that's
10 kind of the intro to that.

11 MR. FINNEGAN: Can I ask a clarifying
12 question based on that? And that may help the
13 context. The report seemed to spend a lot of time
14 talking about the ISC.

15 MR. WEEKS: And that's why I said what I
16 said. What we chose to do and we're considering
17 changing it in the next draft of the report is we put
18 a lot of background information in so people could
19 understand what happens before the provisioning
20 process starts so it didn't just sort of, bang, hit
21 you in the face.

22 And we realized in reading your questions
23 that we probably put a bunch of information in there
24 that wasn't relevant to the process itself. And I
25 don't know if that's misleading or just annoying.

0032

1 There are other parts of the report where that same
2 information is housed where we're talking about the
3 order management type of activities, the test 12 kind
4 of stuff.

5 And so probably what we're going to do
6 when we revise this report is take out all the
7 references to the order management activities so that
8 it does just focus on the process, again, at the
9 point where it's in the service order processors and
10 the downstream provisioning is about ready to start.
11 So we apologize. We realize that we probably were
12 guilty of giving you too much information and,
13 therefore, maybe led you astray.

14 MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

15 MR. DELLATORRE: And just to let you know,
16 John, that a lot of that information, if not all of
17 it, will be covered in test 12 sections.

18 MR. WEEKS: It's not going away. It just
19 moved.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: Let me ask you this and
21 this may be something that we have to review back to
22 the MTP. Test 12, as I recall, does not get into

23 process parity. That's more the result of the CLEC
24 side of the process.

25 MR. WEEKS: Yes, I have the MTP here and I
0033

1 asked that same question and so we withdrew. I think
2 there is one part of 12 that sort of talks about
3 that. Go ahead, Joe, and I'll try to get back to you
4 on that.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: We'll go through the
6 Washington state questions and then we'll see if we
7 can return to that.

8 MR. CONNOLLY: Before you do that, when
9 you do the review of 12.7, you're going to give us an
10 overall status of where you are with the test. Mike
11 said essentially putting it in front of him. Can you
12 give us a gauge on this 14.7?

13 MR. WEEKS: In terms of 53 criteria, 53
14 satisfied, is that what you're asking, Tim?

15 MR. CONNOLLY: In 12.7, you went beyond
16 that and said, we've got 10 criteria essentially
17 satisfied, we're fundamentally done with these tests.
18 Is that the same thing --

19 MR. WEEKS: The same basic state, yes.

20 MR. DELLATORRE: The Washington state
21 staff questions. The first was the state specific or
22 region specific activities, and there were none in
23 this process evaluation.

24 The second question was a discussion of
25 any open or unresolved Os and Es. And all Os and Es

0034

1 associated with this test have been closed.

2 The third, are there any material
3 revisions made to the report. And Mike was just
4 discussing a material revision that may take place
5 that for clarity sake, we may remove a lot of the
6 process description of the activities that happened
7 prior to an order getting into SOP because we do
8 discuss the activities before that in some detail and
9 it led to some confusion.

10 So we may have removed that. But with
11 that said, I'll refer back to the first one where we
12 will produce a change log sometime early next week on
13 an ongoing basis that highlights what was changed and
14 what the impetus for that change was.

15 And question number 4, discuss the unable
16 to determines and their relevance. And in this case,
17 there were no unable to determines. Any follow-up
18 questions? Okay.

19 AT&T questions from page 14.7-5. What is
20 the source of the due date information that is
21 populated on the firm order confirmation? And we are
22 going to have a series of questions where we'll be
23 explaining that was not truly part of this test, as
24 John and Mike just discussed. So that was not

25 relevant to the 14.7 test.

0035

1 The same is true for the second question.

2 MS. TRIBBY: Joe, understanding that,
3 based on our understanding, some of these questions
4 may be not applicable, at least directly applicable
5 to 14.7, and I guess the question is, Mike, it's what
6 you're looking at and John's question, is there
7 another opportunity. Do these come up directly
8 somewhere else. And I'm not sure you answered that.
9 I'm not sure these same kind of questions come up in
10 test 12 directly or if there is going to be an
11 opportunity to sort of have discussions about these
12 questions that may not fit here but do they fit
13 somewhere else.

14 MR. DELLATORRE: I would argue that in the
15 test 12 sections of the report, the notions of firm
16 order confirmations, due dates and service order
17 confirmations will be discussed at great length by
18 both KPMG Consulting and HPC. We will be presenting
19 our findings on the timeliness of the performance of
20 both of those two specific responses as well as a
21 host of others and HPC will be discussing their
22 findings in terms of the accuracy, completeness,
23 functionality of those responses.

24 And there is also the PID performance that
25 is certainly directly impacted by questions along

0036

1 this line of reasoning. The question I'm referring
2 to, number 2, did KPMG Consulting see any reason to
3 believe that Qwest's changing of due dates for CLECs
4 at rates that are two to four times higher than for
5 retail customers is due to anything other than
6 disparate processes. Certainly our measurement of
7 due dates in the PID analysis would be at least one
8 relevant measure of that area. But test 12 is
9 really -- will cover this.

10 MR. WEEKS: And more specifically, John
11 Finnegan and I have been discussing on the side here
12 the only real reference that either one of us have
13 found so far in section 12 to address parity, there
14 is not a section like 12.7, ordering process parity
15 test or something like that that's called out
16 specifically.

17 I'll refer you to section 12.6.2, the
18 activities list, and number 21 under that in the MTP.
19 It says, assess the quality of business processes and
20 compare where information is available with
21 equivalent retail processes. So one could argue
22 that's the hook for order management to assess when
23 there are relevant processes both in wholesale and
24 retail that should be compared, that that's the MTP
25 mandate to do that.

0037

1 So the descriptions of the order, as we
2 were saying earlier -- the descriptions of the order
3 management activities will be taken out of 14.7 which
4 will just focus on provisioning alone. I believe the
5 section 12 report would already have contained
6 descriptions of how the ISC works and all that sort
7 of stuff. So the descriptive kind of background
8 information will be out of 14.7 and into 12, and the
9 activities associated with looking at order
10 management process parity, if you will, would be
11 covered I think under this number 21 activity that's
12 ordered in MTP.

13 MR. FINNEGAN: Just for the record, I
14 found another perhaps relevant reference in table
15 12.4.2 on page 51 of version 5.0 of the MTP. And the
16 evaluation measure for preordering and ordering is
17 consistency with retail capability. That may be
18 associated with the activity but that appears to be
19 another relevant reference.

20 MR. WEEKS: Right. It's an inspection
21 type of thing. Same sort of activity we describe in
22 here.

23 MR. DELLATORRE: And one more enhancement.
24 Sections 12.8 and 24.8 are both process evaluations
25 of the help desks and the manual ordering work

0038

1 center.

2 MR. WEEKS: Manual ordering was called out
3 specifically but it looks more like a feature
4 function test.

5 MR. FINNEGAN: If I could make a request
6 as you're preparing those section 12 reports, could
7 you consider the questions we've asked that are going
8 to get the not relevant response --

9 MR. WEEKS: Certainly. If you have these
10 questions, then we know you're going to have them
11 again. So the answer to your question is yes.

12 MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

13 MR. DELLATORRE: So we can move forward to
14 question number 4. After an SBM sales consultant
15 submits an order into the SOP, are they required to
16 conduct three checks in SOAC to ensure that the order
17 flows through downstream properly. The answer is
18 yes. Our reference is 14.7 page 6 in the SBM retail
19 sales center description.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: A clarifying question. Is
21 there a specific reference --

22 MR. WEEKS: So the complete answer is we
23 will be revising the report to reflect that.

24 MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 5. Describe the

0039

1 retail function that is performed by Qwest personnel
2 or operations that is equivalent to those performed

3 by the SDCs to conduct, quote, three checks in SOAC
4 to ensure that the order flows. Is this function
5 reflected in Qwest's M&Ps? Again, the answer is yes.
6 Same reference. KPMG reviewed M&Ps and we will make
7 that reference more explicit.

8 Number 6. Do Qwest's retail M&Ps show
9 that retail orders with a request for an expedite
10 should fall out for manual processing ("RMA") after
11 the sales consultant has submitted the order to the
12 SOP? The answer is no.

13 And in fact, as a general principle, or
14 just to respond to several questions upcoming, there
15 is no distinction between the retail and wholesale
16 orders for a request for an expedite, for work left
17 in, for a CSR and final and several of the other
18 conditions raised in questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,
19 12, 13 and 14. KPMG Consulting's analysis determined
20 that these were parity by design; that the orders
21 move through the system and are treated by the system
22 without regard for the origination, retail or
23 wholesale.

24 MR. FINNEGAN: John Finnegan with a
25 clarifying question. Can you explain a little more,

0040

1 I don't understand how that last response reconciles
2 with the no response to AT&T's question 6. You're
3 saying that an expedite would not fall out for manual
4 processing yet that request for manual processing is
5 on the -- or the expedited orders, one of the
6 conditions listed by Qwest that would cause a CLEC
7 order to fall out for manual processing. So if a
8 CLEC request for expedite falls out for manual
9 processing but a retail order does not, I don't
10 understand how that can be parity by design.

11 MR. DELLATORRE: Well, two things. First,
12 let me be clear on the answer of no. The answer of
13 no was not a yes/no in response to the automated
14 processing but rather a response to, do Qwest's
15 retail M&Ps show this information. The answer is no.

16 MR. WEEKS: There is not a difference in
17 the way they get processed but the M&P doesn't
18 specifically describe the case that you're talking
19 about.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: So if I called up as a
21 retail customer and wanted an expedite on an order
22 and the --

23 MR. DELLATORRE: It's treated the same
24 way.

25 MR. WEEKS: The same way as if a wholesale

0041

1 CLEC called up and asked for an expedited order.

2 MR. FINNEGAN: My understanding is from a
3 CLEC process, we would make some notation on the
4 order and we would get through the front end of the

5 Qwest system, then it would fall out for manual
6 processing. Is that the same situation with retail?
7 Is the front line retail representative typing an
8 order, making a notation that there is a request for
9 an expedite, the order goes further downstream into
10 the system then falls out and there is a second group
11 or second individual that manually processes that
12 order?

13 MR. WEEKS: That's what we were told, it
14 would work exactly the same way. A retail rep's
15 request for an expedite would result in the same
16 downstream processing as a CLEC's request for an
17 expedite.

18 MR. FINNEGAN: Downstream manual
19 processing?

20 MR. WEEKS: Right.

21 MS. TRIBBY: Were you able to analyze that
22 at all, Mike, or were you just told?

23 MR. DELLATORRE: Let me clarify something
24 briefly, Mary. We'll come back to that. We want to
25 make a very clear distinction between a concept here

0042

1 that was used and that is a flow-through.
2 Flow-through is a very well-established concept and
3 process in the ordering world. So the flow-through
4 through IMA and generating FOCs and errors and not --
5 and non-flow-through is not what we are talking about
6 here.

7 The provisioning systems and whether or
8 not it goes through that is the concept here. And we
9 were going to make some -- we were going to add some
10 clarifying language to the report to try and remove
11 the word flow-through wherever possible because we
12 did want to make a distinction between activities
13 from sort of the firewall through the gateway up
14 through SOP and then the provisioning systems after
15 that because that's what we're talking about here.
16 And it's in those back end systems where there is no
17 distinction between the origination point of that
18 order, whether it was a retail rep that put it into
19 SOP or a wholesale customer called up and got the
20 order ultimately into SOP.

21 MR. WEEKS: So flow-through is an order
22 concept and lights out automated provisioning is a
23 concept for purposes of this test. And so we're
24 unlinking what would happen on the order side from
25 what would happen on the provisioning side.

0043

1 MR. FINNEGAN: Let me make a clarifying
2 question and maybe a suggestion. The series of
3 questions specifically related to flow-through and I
4 was somewhat surprised that today's session you
5 indicated those as non-relevant, to be deferred to
6 some ordering process discussion. But since you went

7 into an answer to the question, I thought maybe it's
8 fair game. If it's perhaps more relevant to talk
9 about it a different time --
10 MR. WEEKS: If your questions were at the
11 ordering process as opposed to at the provisioning
12 process, we would move the answer -- we would move
13 those questions and the answers to test 12. If you
14 were focused on the provisioning implications, if the
15 order is already in SOP, it's already sitting there,
16 is it handled differently downstream for an expedite,
17 for example.
18 MR. FINNEGAN: Well, and this may be the
19 gray area, too. If we talk about once it's in SOP,
20 there are occasions where a CLEC will send an order
21 and it will flow through to the SOP, receive a firm
22 order confirmation and then something happens
23 downstream that says, whoops, we made a mistake, we
24 have to change the due date, now you're going to get
25 a new due date.

0044

1 MR. WEEKS: Okay.
2 MR. FINNEGAN: Do you consider that a
3 provisioning process or is that ordering when
4 post-FOC, there is a due date change?
5 MR. WEEKS: I would say in that case, once
6 the order is in the SOP, then all the activities that
7 happen after that in general we consider part of the
8 provisioning process test, not part of the order
9 management test. So if there are facts that weren't
10 known at the time the FOC was generated that caused
11 someone to need to go in and change a date,
12 facilities aren't available or whatever the reason
13 might be, CO burns down, whatever it is, and
14 provisioning can't get completed in the way that it
15 was acknowledged through the ordering process, yes,
16 we would consider that part of the provisioning test
17 to look at the processes that would have dealt with
18 that.
19 MR. FINNEGAN: Let me go back to the
20 second question, then, because that was getting at a
21 changing of due dates after there has already been an
22 FOC received.
23 MR. WEEKS: Question 2 or question 7?
24 MR. FINNEGAN: Question 2. That was a
25 response that it was not relevant for discussion.

0045

1 MR. DELLATORRE: Let me see if I can
2 clarify. And this really, I think, gets very much to
3 the use of the word flow-through and the confusion
4 around that. On the second page of the discrete
5 report, 14.7-2, the sentence that starts with,
6 according to Qwest, approximately 90 percent, where I
7 would like you to focus is where it says POTS orders
8 flow automatically through LFACS, SWITCH/FOMS and

9 MARCH. That's significant. That's the distinction
10 that we're calling.

11 It's not that these are flow-through
12 orders the way orders are treated in assessment and
13 flowing through from GUI and EDI interface, but
14 rather these are the back end provisioning systems,
15 if you will, LFACS and SWITCH and MARCH, that these
16 are getting kicked out of that process. So that's
17 the distinction that these are non-flow-through
18 orders in the FOC sense and, therefore, the
19 distinction, fine as it may sound, between question
20 number 2 and questions 6 through 14 is that question
21 2, the FOC change and then FOC performance and due
22 date performance, is likely to be considered an order
23 management evaluation.

24 If the order was appropriately after the
25 SOP order entry, if it appropriately dropped for

0046

1 manual handling because of a facilities issue and was
2 appropriately reconfirmed, then the provisioning
3 process itself worked as advertised. That may have
4 an impact on due date performance, it may have an
5 impact on intervals, et cetera. But it does not
6 imply that this process, which has a clear start and
7 stop point that we were evaluating, failed in some
8 way or another.

9 MR. FINNEGAN: Maybe I used the wrong word
10 in talking about throw-through on that question 2 or
11 prefacing the question with use of the term
12 flow-through. It's a case here where a due date has
13 been provided on an FOC, then sometime after that,
14 for whatever reason, there is a need to change the
15 due date. The date of the Qwest shows -- commercial
16 data shows there is quite a bit difference in the
17 rates of due date changes for retail versus due date
18 changes for CLEC.

19 I understand that test 12 or some of the
20 other actual provisioning tests are going to produce
21 some data to see if you see the same type of
22 activity. My question, or one I perhaps should have
23 asked, is if we assume that the results will show
24 this, that you'll be able to confirm what the
25 commercial results show, is there any process reason

0047

1 why this should occur?

2 MR. WEEKS: And the answer is, based on
3 our examination of the process, there is nothing
4 fundamental about the process that would make that
5 true. Take a computer program, it's dated, it gets
6 processed, there is output. You get two different
7 streams of data, two different streams of output. We
8 didn't see anything in our process review that
9 suggests there would be a process reason why that
10 would be true.

11 MS. TRIBBY: Let me just ask one question.
12 It's sort of gray here as to what we're talking about
13 so to try to set the ground rules a little bit, back
14 to question 6, if what you're saying is accurate,
15 that once it reaches the SOAC, the orders are treated
16 the same way, and then you go back to John's
17 question, which is, is the retail order taker doing
18 the same thing as once they receive a wholesale order
19 that's expedited. I guess the question is, do they
20 have to do something on the front end that shows how
21 it's going to be treated in the SOP? Do you know
22 what I'm saying?

23 MR. WEEKS: That would be covered in
24 section 12, parity of process kind of thing. If
25 fundamentally how I order and the options and the

0048

1 functions that are available to me on retail for
2 ordering are different than they are in wholesale,
3 that ought to come out in the results of test 12,
4 sort of process parity for ordering test.

5 If, by the time, which we believe to be
6 true, a service order is written into the SOP, all
7 service orders look alike whether they came from
8 retail or came from wholesale, the same fields, same
9 values, the same kind of flags and all that kind of
10 stuff, which we fundamentally believe to be true, and
11 it's handled exactly the same way downstream, that
12 whether there is or isn't a difference between what a
13 rep needs to do in order to get orders into SOP
14 versus wholesale, that's a test 12 issue.

15 But once it's in the SOP and the ordering
16 engine is turned off and the provisioning engine is
17 turned on, the demark item is that database that's
18 the order processor. That's the demark between
19 ordering and provisioning. What we're saying is we
20 looked at the process downstream from there and we
21 didn't discover anything in the process itself that
22 would suggest a wholesale order and a retail order
23 that are similarly configured, same information, same
24 basic services and so on, gets treated any
25 differently.

0049

1 MS. TRIBBY: Okay. So I think that makes
2 the line a little clearer for me, Mike. Assume they
3 have to be the same once they get to the SOP to be
4 treated the same, if there is some different
5 treatment on the ordering end such that one
6 automatically falls out and one isn't so designated,
7 that will come out or should come out in test 12?

8 MR. WEEKS: And that's a flow-through
9 concept for ordering as opposed to automated
10 provisioning, which is those orders that could be
11 provisioned lights out without human intervention and
12 all you have to do is a search translation or

13 something like that, versus trunks after all, and by
14 definition, it's manual.

15 MS. ANDERSON: It sounds to me like
16 everything from 6 to 14 we're saying will be
17 addressed in 12?

18 MR. WEEKS: Yes.

19 MS. ANDERSON: Then perhaps we can move
20 on. Any problem with that?

21 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes. I'm sorry, I don't
22 agree with that. It won't be addressed in 12. These
23 are discussing how orders are handled in the
24 provisioning systems and our findings suggest that
25 orders are handled without distinction between

0050

1 wholesale and retail and we will not be discussing
2 the processing of orders in systems like LFACS and
3 MARCH in the test 12. That's what happened here.
4 And what we found is there is parity by design.

5 MS. ANDERSON: I'm sorry, I misspoke.

6 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 2.

7 MS. ANDERSON: Right. In any event, we
8 think it's time to move on, is that right?

9 MR. WEEKS: That's right.

10 MS. ANDERSON: Thank you for being honest
11 with me, Joe.

12 MR. DELLATORRE: You're welcome. So we'll
13 jump to question 15. After a retail customer has
14 been provided a due date for service, are there
15 conditions listed in the retail M&Ps under which
16 Qwest will reject the order for a lack of facilities?
17 If there are conditions, what are they?

18 (Caucus.)

19 MR. WEEKS: So correct me if I'm wrong
20 here. I believe our answer is, if a retail customer
21 has gotten a due date, do the retail M&Ps ever
22 acknowledge or deal with the case of where an order
23 should be turned back because we subsequently
24 discovered there is a lack of facilities? That's the
25 question that's being answered?

0051

1 MR. FINNEGAN: That's correct.

2 MR. WEEKS: Do the retail M&Ps allow for
3 pending facilities or missing facilities type of
4 feedback back to the retail customer and the retail
5 customer gets told, I'm sorry, I don't know what
6 you're looking for.

7 MR. FINNEGAN: Yes, and you can't have it.

8 MR. WEEKS: The answer to that is yes, it
9 can happen. Do we know all of the conditions in the
10 M&P that would cause that? To your next part of that
11 question, we don't have a comprehensive list of all
12 the conditions that could cause that to be true. I
13 don't think that's in the report. I'm pretty sure
14 that would be in the -- might be in the M&Ps but I

15 would be surprised if all the conditions that are in
16 there are documented but we can follow up on that and
17 see if we can find out what those conditions are.

18 MR. DELLATORRE: Well, it is in parity
19 treatment of them.

20 MR. WEEKS: The same conditions would
21 visit themselves on retail and wholesale, if that's
22 the question you're getting to. There is not a
23 specific list for retail and there is another
24 specific list for wholesale and the lists are
25 different.

0052

1 MR. FINNEGAN: Let me provide some context
2 that may help in the investigation. For unbundled
3 loops, there are conditions where Qwest will say,
4 there aren't facilities available, we're not going to
5 build any facilities so --

6 MR. WEEKS: In an unbundled loop, the
7 retail equivalent of that is --

8 MR. CRAIN: There is none.

9 MR. FINNEGAN: It depends on what you're
10 talking about. There are some retail equivalents in
11 maintenance. And there are also some unbundled loops
12 where there are retail equivalents.

13 MR. WEEKS: What's the heart of the
14 question that you want us to answer?

15 MR. CRAIN: It sounds like you're getting
16 at a legal duty and a legal question. It sounds like
17 you're getting into a legal issue of when you have an
18 obligation to build rather than an issue about the
19 actual provisioning process steps.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: I'm not necessarily
21 limiting it just to obligation of building as a legal
22 issue. My understanding is a retail process is a
23 point where they may say we don't have anything out
24 there and the only way you're going to get anything
25 out there is if you pay to have -- a few thousand

0053

1 dollars to have us construct some facilities. That
2 option appears to be available to retail customers.
3 It does not always appear to be available to
4 wholesale customers.

5 MR. WEEKS: I hear two possible questions
6 and let me ask to know which one, or maybe both, you
7 want answered. Are you asking us when there is a
8 lack of facilities, whether there is any
9 difference -- when the reason the order can't be
10 provisioned is lack of facilities, if there is any
11 difference in treatment between wholesale and retail,
12 is that one of the questions that you asked?

13 MR. FINNEGAN: One of the questions, with
14 the preface that a due date has already been
15 provided.

16 MR. WEEKS: I understand. Because I think

17 I know where you're going with this.

18 MR. FINNEGAN: Then there is a subsequent
19 determination that there are no facilities available.

20 MR. WEEKS: Customer has been notified in
21 both cases, you have to go back to the customer in
22 both cases and say, I'm sorry, we don't have
23 facilities available and we either have to change the
24 date or we just can't do the order at all, and you
25 want to know if there are differences in wholesale

0054

1 and retail under that fact pattern?

2 MR. FINNEGAN: Yes. And to borrow a term
3 from a previous test, there appears to be some
4 remedial options available to the retail customer
5 where they can pay construction charges and those
6 remedial options may not be available as a matter of
7 process.

8 MR. WEEKS: I understand. We will
9 double-check this since there seems to be -- our
10 answer to you was going to be it's the same. We will
11 double-check that.

12 MR. CRAIN: And I think any such
13 evaluation needs to be done and I don't think it's
14 entirely appropriate to deal with all those issues in
15 the test. These things have been extensively briefed
16 and discussed in the checklist workshops about when
17 you have an obligation on wholesale versus when you
18 have an obligation on retail to build and when you
19 decide to build. It's not always exactly the same
20 and I think that was literally defined in both
21 chapter 7.2 and chapter 7.3 workshops. So the idea
22 that you're always going to end up with the same
23 result and always end up in the same decision -- with
24 the same decision, I don't think is accurate.

25 MR. FINNEGAN: The question was more a

0055

1 Sergeant Friday question.

2 MR. WEEKS: That's how I'm treating it, is
3 we will go back and look at our work papers, look at
4 our interview notes, look at the M&P conditions and
5 answer precisely the question, if retail and
6 wholesale customers have both been provided with due
7 dates and, subsequent to that time, it's discovered
8 that facilities are not available to fulfill that
9 provisioning request, is there any difference in
10 retail and wholesale in terms of how that order gets
11 processed? Well, it gets processed one way or the
12 other, even if it's put in a circular can. So we
13 will look at our interview notes, look at what the
14 M&Ps say and we'll get back to you on whether there
15 is or isn't a difference in that regard.

16 MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

17 MS. ANDERSON: Now is the time for our
18 morning break. Is this a good time for you guys?

19 MR. DELLATORRE: Sure.
20 MR. WEEKS: Sure. Why not.
21 MS. TRIBBY: Denise, before we break, just
22 one clarifying question. On 8 through 14 which we
23 deferred, the question, as you pointed out, Joe, that
24 John asked was do Qwest retail M&Ps show -- the
25 answer on 8 was no and then you went into the

0056

1 description about there is no distinction between
2 retail and wholesale. Is the question no as to what
3 the M&Ps show on each, 8 through 14?

4 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes.

5 MS. TRIBBY: Thank you.

6 MS. THIELEMANN: Just to be clear, those
7 weren't deferred.

8 MR. DELLATORRE: Right. We responded to
9 all in one response.

10 (Recess.)

11 MS. ANDERSON: A couple of questions have
12 come up. This is fully transcribed. I got a couple
13 of voice mail messages about people being surprised
14 that this was being transcribed. It has always been
15 the plan and it's been talked about several times and
16 I think it's even in the TAG minutes. So a question
17 about the transcription document. A draft will be
18 available tonight for review. The final will be
19 available tomorrow and we'll get it in an ASCII file
20 that can be imported into WORD and we'll distribute
21 it once all that happens. So in case folks had
22 questions on that, that is the plan. Are we ready to
23 resume now?

24 A couple of words. We're giving up on all
25 of these handheld and pedestal type mikes. The best

0057

1 approach is to look up at these little white things
2 hanging down and project. So with that, anybody on
3 the bridge, can you hear us or is it better than in
4 the beginning?

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's much better
6 now.

7 MS. ANDERSON: We did a few test calls
8 ourself and it seemed to be much better. With that,
9 we're ready to resume. And with that, Joe, take it
10 away.

11 MR. DELLATORRE: I believe we left off at
12 question 16. And just for tracking purposes, in some
13 cases, we broke out multiple questions or a question
14 that was numbered with one number and we split them
15 up into several questions and, therefore, there may
16 be cases as we get toward the end of the total number
17 of questions where the total number of questions
18 reflected in our sheets may be higher than the
19 original number of questions submitted. And that's
20 simply because, in some cases, we broke out questions

21 into individual numbers. The total number of
22 questions should be the same whether or not they're
23 numbered or not.

24 Question number 16. The report states,
25 "Next, the implementer calls the customer to confirm
0058

1 the order due date, time and work to be performed."
2 Is the telephone call in addition to or a replacement
3 for the FOC? The answer is that it is in addition
4 to. The second question, how does the implementer
5 determine the actual order due date and time to
6 confirm with the customer? It is actually located
7 and taken from the order itself.

8 Question 17. How did KPMG Consulting
9 determine that for the CORAC function, "No preference
10 is given to retail or wholesale orders"?

11 MR. FINNEGAN: Joe, can I interrupt with a
12 clarifying question on the last answer?

13 MR. DELLATORRE: Sure.

14 MR. FINNEGAN: You said the order due date
15 is found on the order itself. Are you talking about
16 the service order, the Qwest service order?

17 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes. So the implementer
18 uses the Qwest service order to get the order due
19 date.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: Do you recall where the due
21 date comes from, the Qwest service order?

22 MR. WEEKS: You mean how does this Qwest
23 service order due date get populated?

24 MR. FINNEGAN: Yes.

25 (Caucus.)

0059

1 MR. FINNEGAN: To clarify, my
2 understanding was the service order would be pre-SOP.

3 MR. WEEKS: No, it's created in SOP.

4 MS. THIELEMANN: There isn't a service
5 order in --

6 MR. FINNEGAN: So with that correction,
7 then, the service order is entered into the service
8 order process. And the question would be, how does
9 that get populated, the due date?

10 (Caucus.)

11 MR. WEEKS: So the answer is, it's in WFA.
12 Now the question is, how does it get in WFA? That's
13 not part of this stream. That's really an order
14 management question, I would think, because how
15 orders get processed is part of order management.
16 How service orders get processed downstream is the
17 provisioning question so I'm not sure these guys
18 would know the answer to that question. But we can
19 find out the answer to that question. I'm sure it's
20 different for retail and wholesale. I'm sure it's
21 different for EDI versus GUI, but conceptually, it's
22 the same.

23 MR. DELLATORRE: I believe this is a
24 similar question to what we were discussing earlier.
25 I think it was question number 2. Is this that

0060

1 question? Question number 2 said -- or question
2 number 1, actually, yes, you're right. It was the
3 actual population of the due date.

4 MR. FINNEGAN: Yes.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: So we take that back. My
6 expectation is that manual orders of the STC and
7 flow-through orders from SOP itself, but we will get
8 a clarification on that.

9 MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

10 MR. DELLATORRE: So number 17. How did
11 KPMG Consulting determine that for the CORAC
12 function, no preference is given to retail or
13 wholesale orders? And that was through observations
14 and inspections where we actually watched orders
15 being processed and noted that the due dates -- it
16 was preferenced by due date, not by wholesale or
17 retail distinction.

18 The same is true for question 18. The
19 preference is by due date, not wholesale or retail.

20 Question 19. What analysis did KPMG
21 Consulting perform on the existence and adequacy of
22 the processes and the adherence to the wholesale and
23 retail processes for accounting for customer-caused
24 provisioning delays? By definition, our evaluation
25 measures show consistency and repeatability as

0061

1 compared to retail and we observed the processes in
2 action and assessed -- almost by default the fact
3 that we were observing them implies existence. And
4 as a parity test, the parity by design is the way
5 this particular process is structured.

6 And furthermore, we go on to explain in a
7 little bit more detail within the specific criteria,
8 as an example, 14.7-1-36, as an example, where we say
9 that KPMG Consulting observed both LRAC and CORAC
10 load specialists dispatching revision orders. The
11 load specialists pulled work lists from WFA and
12 worked them in order, in due date order. Dispatches
13 were based on specific geographic regions and on due
14 dates. No preference was given to retail or
15 wholesale orders.

16 MR. FINNEGAN: If I could add a clarifying
17 question and provide some context as well, the real
18 important point of this question was the
19 customer-caused provisioning delays. I understand
20 that generally observation and inspection was the
21 method you chose to do your analysis. Did you pay
22 any particular attention to the process that was used
23 for assigning customer-caused delays to an order?

24 (Caucus.)

25
0062

MR. DELLATORRE: We did not make

1 particular note or observation of customer-caused
2 provisioning delays. However, John, just for a
3 little bit of enhancement, that is an area of
4 analysis in test 14 which is the transaction version
5 or transaction section of the provision evaluation.

6 MR. FINNEGAN: So at least in this point,
7 the second half of that question was, what findings
8 and conclusions did KPMG Consulting reach as a result
9 of that analysis. If we understand the analysis to
10 be the process for assigning customer-caused delays.
11 At this point, is it fair to say KPMG Consulting has
12 not reached any conclusions on the process for
13 assigning customer-caused delays?

14 MR. WEEKS: I think our answer would be a
15 little bit different than that. I think our answer
16 would be, as far as we can tell, the process is the
17 same. In terms of building a record on whether codes
18 get assigned properly as a performance issue, that
19 would be judged under 14, which is not a process.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: I'm going to be jumping a
21 little bit into the next question. The analysis
22 appeared to have focused on the LRAC and CORAC, if I
23 remember my acronyms. An important point of that
24 assignment of customer-caused delays would be the
25 technicians in the field themselves who may be

0063

1 telling LRAC this was a customer-caused miss. The
2 question on the --

3 MR. WEEKS: The answer to your question, I
4 think, is this is a process review, not a conformance
5 review over time, so to speak, so that observing
6 technicians in the field and whether they're coding
7 things properly or not would not be in the scope of a
8 process test.

9 MR. FINNEGAN: No, but I understand what
10 you're saying is you reviewed the M&Ps that the
11 technician should follow and there appeared to be no
12 difference.

13 MR. WEEKS: Right. And we watched the
14 process in the centers and they appeared to be
15 following the processes in the centers. The process
16 in the field gets observed as a part of our test 14,
17 not this test.

18 MR. DELLATORRE: And in fact, to cover the
19 follow-on section of your question there, evaluation
20 criteria 14.7-1-47 explicitly states that the M&Ps
21 used in the dispatch center are the same for retail
22 and wholesale observations. The same M&Ps are used
23 in the retail and wholesale operations and we
24 reviewed the CORAC loading priorities and found no
25 differences in the M&Ps used for retail and wholesale

0064

1 orders.

2 MR. FINNEGAN: But that's in response in
3 regards to the centers. If I understood Mike's
4 response, you've also examined the M&Ps for the field
5 folks.

6 MR. DELLATORRE: And that is 14, the test
7 section. Question 20. Did KPMG Consulting interview
8 or observe in action any Qwest field technicians for
9 purposes of this evaluation? And that gets back to
10 what we just said. The answer is no, for this test
11 section.

12 21, "The results of this test are
13 presented in the table below definitions of
14 evaluation criteria, et cetera." This is the same
15 flavor of question that I responded to earlier that
16 we will see recur on several occasions in terms of
17 defining our evaluation criteria upfront. Those are
18 the evaluation criteria that are the body of the
19 results table in the discrete report sections.

20 One additional question in the section,
21 though, that merits further explanation is there is
22 some standard language in there that refers to,
23 quote, possible results. And the reason that that is
24 in there is because this is not the final report.
25 This is a discrete report section that in fact is a

0065

1 draft discrete report and, therefore, for a myriad of
2 reasons, may change, whether it's due to findings in
3 other test sections, additional activities for this
4 particular test section, comments and questions in
5 forums like this, et cetera. So that is why we use
6 the "impossible results."

7 MR. WEEKS: When you see section Roman II
8 in this report, it refers to a not yet distributed
9 boilerplate report which would be like the equivalent
10 of a discrete report. And it will describe all of
11 the -- you know, what does satisfied mean, what does
12 not satisfied mean, all that kind of stuff. So
13 rather than repeating that explanation of what all
14 the evaluation results could be, in every discrete
15 report, we brought it up into a section Roman II as
16 one place in the report to go get the definition of
17 when it is not satisfied.

18 MS. ANDERSON: Folks on the bridge, could
19 you please be sure your mute buttons are on? I don't
20 believe we have any microphones here that are close
21 enough to pick up anything. So we've got somebody on
22 the bridge without their mute button on. The mute
23 cops will come soon. Thank you.

24 MS. TRIBBY: Can I just diverge a minute
25 to ask a process question? When you talk about these

0066

1 discrete reports being draft reports, and I
2 understand that not every report will result in a

3 discrete report prior to the draft report. The draft
4 report will have some new discrete reports, if you
5 will.

6 MR. DELLATORRE: Correct.

7 MS. TRIBBY: Maybe you don't know this yet
8 at this point because you don't know how much work is
9 yet involved but will these discrete reports become
10 final, the ones that have been issued already to
11 date, will they be final in the draft final report or
12 will they be final in the final final report?

13 MR. WEEKS: The latter.

14 MS. TRIBBY: Thank you.

15 MR. DELLATORRE: So our draft final report
16 will be issued with all of the sections in a draft
17 state and then we will conclude with a final report
18 for all sections. That is the final.

19 MS. TRIBBY: So we wouldn't expect these
20 reports that we're reviewing today to be changed
21 until the final final report?

22 MR. WEEKS: No, I think what you will see,
23 just -- we've discussed already this morning, the
24 fact that we're going to be moving some stuff that
25 was -- descriptive stuff about the order management

0067

1 process out of this test because it was confusing and
2 misleading. So that's an example of a change that's
3 going to take place and we'll reissue, republish that
4 discrete report.

5 Our objective is to get information out
6 into the people's hands as reasonably quickly as
7 possible so that what we hope to converge -- we had
8 hoped to converge so that by the draft final, there
9 is very little that's wiggling between the draft
10 final and the final final, but that hasn't been the
11 case so far. I mean, every time we touch one of
12 these, every time we have a meaningful conversation
13 about them, every time we have a technical conference
14 on it, there are suggestions for improvement.

15 And we're going to keep making those
16 suggestions for improvement so that the final final
17 is the last thing that wiggles and we're going to try
18 to work towards minimizing how much changes between
19 the draft final and the final final, but there will
20 be changes between those two, I'm sure.

21 MS. TRIBBY: So you may put out revised
22 discrete reports prior to the draft?

23 MR. WEEKS: Absolutely. In fact, you'll
24 see some coming out this week.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: We intend to.

0068

1 MS. TRIBBY: But the other changes that
2 may be based on the test itself or other things that
3 you want to do with these discrete reports will be
4 reflected in the final final report?

5 MR. DELLATORRE: For discrete reports that
6 have already been issued, we will try to issue them
7 in as timely a manner -- regardless of the reason for
8 the change. If the change is from something in this
9 conference, then we will incorporate those and
10 release the revised version. If the change is
11 because of a related testing area, we will do the
12 same. We will release it when it's prepared. There
13 is no impetus for change that will cause us to wait
14 until the draft final report. We will attempt to
15 publish revised discrete reports on an ongoing timely
16 basis.

17 MR. WEEKS: But as you pointed out,
18 because you'll see some for the first time in the
19 draft, I would expect changes between the draft and
20 the final.

21 MS. TRIBBY: Thanks.

22 MR. SPINKS: Are these subsequent revised
23 reports going to come out in a red-lined version?

24 MR. WEEKS: We certainly could make a
25 red-lined version available. We also talked earlier

0069

1 today about a change log that would help people
2 identify where the changes were.

3 MR. RUTTER: I think we should also be
4 clear that we've done this already. What Joe and
5 Mike are talking about is not news. You've seen us
6 issue a revised report and a second revised report.
7 Friday we issued a new version of 20.7. So this is
8 consistent with what we've been doing.

9 MR. WEEKS: Right. And you can --
10 obviously you can take -- you know, manufacture your
11 own delta if you choose by just putting both
12 documents into WORD and having WORD tell you what the
13 differences are. But yeah, we're going to have a
14 change log to make it easier to understand what's
15 changed and why it's changed.

16 MR. FINNEGAN: The lazy amongst us
17 appreciate that.

18 MR. DELLATORRE: Or maybe time challenged
19 rather than lazy.

20 MS. ANDERSON: The one saying he's lazy,
21 that's Finnegan. We know he's really not.

22 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 22. And I
23 believe a few more coming -- go back to the same
24 confusion that we had around the concept of
25 flow-through and whether or not it's ordering

0070

1 flow-through or automated processing of provisioning
2 systems. And I believe that's going to affect a
3 couple of the questions coming up.

4 Question 22, specifically how did KPMG
5 Consulting factor the differing flow-through rates
6 for CLEC and retail orders in the evaluation of

7 whether "inputs to the order processing systems are
8 prioritized using the same method for retail and
9 wholesale operation?" And as we had stated earlier,
10 the ordering flow-through concept is not one that's
11 subject to this evaluation and this test.

12 I believe question 23, the same. How did
13 KPMG Consulting factor the differing flow-through
14 rates for CLEC and retail orders? Did KPMG
15 Consulting find that orders that fall out for manual
16 processing take longer to become accepted by the SOP
17 than orders that do not? These are all flow-through
18 questions and we do have a task that focuses on
19 flow-through specifically, which is test 13. And you
20 will also see -- you've seen some of the results of
21 test 13 through the observation and exception process
22 already.

23 Question 24. Provide the evaluation
24 criteria used in this test. Again, that gets to the
25 fact that it may have been some misunderstanding of

0071

1 our language of evaluation criteria in advance in the
2 descriptive sections versus those criteria that we
3 use as the actual measurements in the results tables.
4 The evaluation criteria that we referred to upfront
5 in our evaluation measures and analysis methods are
6 in fact the same evaluation criteria that are noted
7 in the results table.

8 And question 25, provide KPMG Consulting's
9 understanding of any differences in work rules
10 established for the retail versus wholesale order
11 processing centers where those result from collective
12 bargaining agreements.

13 (Caucus.)

14 MR. WEEKS: I think the answer to the
15 question is, it's our understanding from our analysis
16 that a single center processes both wholesale and
17 retail and that while there may be differences when
18 you compare two work centers that may be attributed
19 to collective bargaining agreements, this wasn't part
20 of our analysis, we didn't try to factor this in in
21 any way, shape or form. So if there are differences
22 as a result of collective bargaining agreements,
23 we're not sure what those differences are. And we
24 can say within a center, we're not aware of how that
25 would be relevant by comparing retail to wholesale.

0072

1 MR. CONNOLLY: In this section 14.7, you
2 do describe discrete work centers that support CLECs
3 and discrete work centers that support retail --

4 MR. WEEKS: I think if you read that real
5 closely, and we went back and reread that very
6 closely, both wholesale and retail orders go through
7 both centers. It turns out that the relationship
8 between the volume of wholesale orders and retail

9 orders is not the same in each center but centers
10 aren't organized by wholesale and retail. They're
11 organized by product.

12 MR. CONNOLLY: But part of the 14.7 deals
13 with the ISC and the role the ISC plays.

14 MR. WEEKS: But it's not because the ISC
15 is ordering and it's not --

16 MR. DELLATORRE: The ISC has a very, very
17 small role, if any technically, because they're
18 entering the orders from the wholesale side. We made
19 the comment early on about the SBMs and the fact that
20 they touch and check SOAC. So there is some
21 parallelism there but it truly is prior to the scope
22 of this evaluation.

23 MR. CONNOLLY: So if we look at the
24 provisioning centers after the order has matured into
25 the service order process and to the point where it's

0073

1 going to be provisioned, that those centers had
2 orders irrespective of the origin.

3 MR. WEEKS: Source.

4 MR. CONNOLLY: Or without specific
5 concentration on the product type? They knew their
6 provisioning?

7 MR. DELLATORRE: That's correct.

8 MR. CONNOLLY: That's why you've answered
9 that?

10 MR. DELLATORRE: That's correct. Okay.
11 We'll move on to the Worldcom questions. The first
12 question was a request for clarification. When we
13 referred to IMA, the question was, please verify IMA
14 encompasses GUI and EDI interfaces. The answer is
15 yes.

16 The second question. A quote from our
17 report. According to Qwest, approximately 90 percent
18 of POTS orders flow automatically through LFACS,
19 SWITCH, FOMS and MARCH. The question is, did KPMG
20 verify this assertion? The answer is no. We will
21 remove that number, the 90 percent number, from a
22 subsequent version of the report because as we had
23 stated earlier that the treatment of the orders, when
24 it is in those provisioning systems, are treated
25 without distinction from wholesale to retail and,

0074

1 therefore, the percentage that flows through -- and I
2 really shouldn't use that.

3 The percentage that is automatically
4 provisioned through the systems, 90 percent to 50
5 percent is a comparable figure from retail to
6 wholesale. So that 90 percent number may have caused
7 some confusion and we will remove it in a subsequent
8 version.

9 Question number 3. An RMA is generated
10 when any conditions for flow-through are not met.

11 And again, that flow-through I believe is properly
12 the concept of automated provisioning. Then the
13 question is, what are the conditions for
14 flow-through? We are not aware of a single document
15 that highlights each and all of those conditions.
16 They are indicated throughout a variety of Qwest
17 M&Ps. We noted them in several of the Qwest M&Ps.
18 But then back to the notion of design, this is a
19 parity evaluation and because those conditions apply
20 to both wholesale and retail, we did not do an
21 investigation of exactly what those conditions were
22 in each and every individual case.

23 The follow-on question or possibly stand
24 alone, are design service orders ever eligible for
25 flow-through? The answer is yes. And you can refer

0075

1 to page 14.7, page 9 in the DSC work flow process.

2 Question number 5. And the reason I'm
3 often starting with quotes, again, these questions
4 were often embedded into the discrete report sections
5 and therefore I'm trying to provide some of what came
6 just prior to the question to add some context. "In
7 2001, the ISCs were realigned to support specific
8 products for specific customers." The question, did
9 this realignment occur during KPMG's evaluation? The
10 answer is yes. And you can refer to 14.7, page 5,
11 the ISC function.

12 Question 6. "SDCs monitor IMA work
13 queues. They process orders that do not flow through
14 automatically and thus require manual intervention."
15 Question, how are the LSRs flagged for manual
16 handling? And that's again the flow-through issue
17 and it's an ordering issue that will be addressed in
18 our ordering tasks 12 and 13.

19 Question 7. "An SDC accesses a customer's
20 billing records to obtain information about the
21 account." The question, what happens if the
22 customer's billing records doesn't provide the
23 necessary information about the account? And this
24 question was not examined in this section of the
25 test, as it is actually a billing issue.

0076

1 Question 8. And we're seeing a lot of
2 repeats around the flow-through concept because we
3 have moved from AT&T's questions to Worldcom's
4 questions.

5 MS. BALVIN: And Joe, I apologize. That
6 question for number 7, which billing report will that
7 come out of, the answer to that question?

8 MR. WEEKS: I think the question here is,
9 if I'm doing ordering -- I think the context was I'm
10 doing ordering and I need to access billing
11 information and, for some reason, there is a problem
12 with the billing information, I can't get what I

13 need. Is that the question?

14 MS. BALVIN: Exactly, yes.

15 MR. WEEKS: And so the answer would be, it
16 wouldn't be in a billing test. It would be in the
17 order management test where, if, to the extent that
18 there is a process in place for SDCs to get what they
19 need, if they're not able to obtain what they need,
20 hopefully the billing test -- not billing test,
21 excuse me, the order management test would be the one
22 because it's the order management function that
23 doesn't have what it needs. There would be a
24 corollary, which is why I said, and billing. Why
25 isn't the billing information accurate and complete

0077

1 and all that stuff. So there may be some results
2 that would be relevant from the billing test that
3 might touch on this as well.

4 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 8. And I'm just
5 going to jump straight to the question. Is there set
6 criteria that allows Qwest systems to accept flawed
7 LSRs such that a partial order can be generated?
8 That is a flow-through order management question.

9 Question number 9. "The IIS system
10 receives fewer than 10 percent of all CLEC orders."
11 What evidence was provided KPMG to make such a
12 conclusion statement? This will be removed from a
13 subsequent version of the report. It is not a
14 relevant fact in the report. We were a little bit
15 overzealous of putting in information that we didn't
16 need.

17 Number 10. "A submitted order may become
18 delayed and/or require escalation." Question: When
19 in the process would a submitted order be declared
20 delayed and/or require escalation? And again, this
21 is more an ordering question. So we apologize for
22 causing the confusion. We will make it clearer.

23 Number 11. Do the ISC representatives
24 have access to InfoBuddy? The answer is yes.

25 MS. BALVIN: I need to find the section

0078

1 but the reason I asked that is it wasn't in that one
2 section that identified systems that the ISC has
3 access to. So that will need to be updated in the --

4 MR. WEEKS: It's our understanding, and
5 Qwest is in the room so they can correct me if I'm
6 wrong. Don't all Qwest employees have access to
7 InfoBuddy? Is that true or false?

8 MR. VIVEROS: I think it's accurate to say
9 that employees who need ordering information can get
10 to InfoBuddy and obtain that information, the methods
11 that dictate how they need to process orders or write
12 orders.

13 MR. WEEKS: Would that be true for
14 wholesale and retail?

15 MR. VIVEROS: Yes.
16 MR. WEEKS: Thank you.
17 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 13 is, again, an
18 ordering question. I apologize. Question 12,
19 "Orders flow from Consulting Plus to the
20 geographically aligned," et cetera, and that is an
21 ordering and flow-through issue.

22 Number 13. "Changes to M&Ps," and this is
23 quoted, "are communicated via multichannel
24 communicators, E-mail, voicemail, meetings and
25 teleconferences, as appropriate." The question: Did
0079

1 KPMG witness all of the above methods to communicate
2 changes to Qwest M&Ps? The answer is no.

3 Question 14. "Orders are worked according
4 to RID date, from earliest to latest, without regard
5 for retail or wholesale origination." Question:
6 What evidence was provided that allowed KPMG to make
7 such a conclusion statement? M&Ps call for orders to
8 be worked according to RID date from earliest to
9 latest. So first was an M&P review. Second, KPMG
10 Consulting conducted observations at the DSC in
11 Seattle, Des Moines, or the DSCs, rather, in Seattle,
12 Des Moines and Denver. And through the combination
13 of inspections, observations and documentation
14 review, we observed and concluded that orders were
15 worked according to RID date from earliest to latest.

16 MS. BALVIN: Joe, I just wanted to ask a
17 follow-up question. When you talk about observations
18 and inspections at Qwest sites, were there any
19 processes that KPMG used to possibly preserve any
20 blindness or was Qwest fully aware that these
21 observations and inspections were taking place?

22 (Caucus.)

23 MR. WEEKS: The answer is we selected
24 folks at random but they physically knew they were
25 being observed.

0080

1 MR. DELLATORRE: Additionally, we tried to
2 provide as little advanced warning as possible given
3 the need for the coordination. So there wasn't a
4 published schedule of visits. We tried to show up at
5 the last possible hour.

6 MS. BALVIN: Thank you.

7 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 15. "He or she
8 reviews the design and frame continuity, views the
9 design between central offices and conducted a
10 pre-test on the circuit using testing tools such as
11 OcuView." The request: Please verify, Qwest
12 performs a pre-test on all wholesale and retail
13 circuits. Our response is that M&Ps do call for
14 pretest. In addition, KPMG Consulting performed
15 interviews and observations at Denver and learned
16 that on frame continuity date, the FCD, testers

17 perform a retest using React or OcuView to view a
18 circuit as far as the cable at the request of the
19 CLEC.

20 Number 16. "If the termination point of
21 the circuit is at a long distance carrier's location,
22 the implementer coordinates the end to end acceptance
23 test with that long distance carrier's tester."
24 Request for verification: Please verify, Qwest
25 performed end to end acceptance testing on all

0081

1 wholesale and retail orders. The response is no.
2 Qwest M&P unbundled loop CFA version methods and
3 procedures acceptance testing is conducted upon
4 request from CLECs.

5 MS. TRIBBY: Sorry, I'm a little slow on
6 the uptake here. On 15, the last thing you said was
7 that a CLEC's request. Is the answer that Qwest
8 performs a retest on all retail and wholesale
9 circuits when requested by a CLEC but not otherwise?
10 (Caucus.)

11 MR. WEEKS: That was a 16 answer, not a 15
12 answer.

13 MR. DELLATORRE: So the answer is yes,
14 they do perform the pretest for all.

15 MS. TRIBBY: Okay. And in 16, they only
16 do it when requested?

17 MR. WEEKS: Yes. 15 is all, 16 is as
18 requested.

19 MR. DELLATORRE: There is also additional
20 analysis around this concept in test 14 which gets to
21 M&P adherence.

22 MS. BALVIN: And Joe, to be clear on 15,
23 you said that the M&P calls for that type of test but
24 you didn't observe it every single time.

25 MR. WEEKS: Well, we did look at the M&P

0082

1 and when we were there, we did observe. Then there
2 is a third piece of evidence which is in test 14 that
3 talks about additional performance related measures.
4 But for the purposes of the process test, we're not
5 saying it happened every time everywhere in the
6 entire world for the past 50 years. It happened when
7 we were there and we saw it happen in 14 and
8 developed more of a record.

9 MR. DELLATORRE: And our observations
10 included the Seattle design service center while
11 performing the pretest on FCD and observations in Des
12 Moines including an implementer testing a new T1 line
13 in the field as a part of this process test. So we
14 did make those evaluations. And there is another
15 sort of M&P adherence in test 14.

16 MS. ANDERSON: Just to call attention to
17 -- in test 14, there were several observations and
18 acceptance related to testing. There is probably 25

19 or 50 pages of further detail on that should you want
20 to look at that.

21 MS. TRIBBY: In question 16, did you
22 observe that test being conducted when requested or
23 was that just an M&P review?

24 (Caucus.)

25 MR. WEEKS: On 16, did we actually see a
0083

1 CLEC requested test take place? The answer is no.

2 MR. DELLATORRE: But it is part of 14.

3 Question 17, "The jeopardy response team
4 is available throughout the process to assist in
5 resolving field issues as they arise." Question:
6 Please verify that a jeopardy response team is
7 available for both wholesale and retail orders
8 throughout the process. And I would refer you to
9 14.7, page 24, evaluation criteria 114 which explains
10 that both there is a team available and that there is
11 parity by design in how the orders are treated.

12 MS. BALVIN: Joe, I apologize. I have a
13 question that I did not file previously but I was
14 reading through the report and it's in the section
15 titled DSC systems. And the last system title there
16 is called the multiline test, MLT. I guess my
17 question is, for --

18 MR. WEEKS: What page are you on?

19 MS. BALVIN: I don't have a page.

20 MR. WEEKS: So it's page 14.7-8.

21 MS. BALVIN: It's under the DSC system,
22 it's the last system highlighted called the multiline
23 test. And for wholesale, we have what I would term
24 mechanized loop testing. And I'm just curious if
25 they are one and the same capabilities, systems.

0084

1 MR. WEEKS: That's a question of fact. We
2 would have to investigate.

3 MS. BALVIN: Thank you. I apologize for
4 that. I just noticed it.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: Number 18. What date
6 does the DVA line up with for wholesale (i.e. FOC)
7 versus retail? And our response is the DVA date is
8 an internal date which does not exactly correspond to
9 the date on the FOC. There is a relationship.

10 MR. WEEKS: It is not the FOC date.

11 MS. BALVIN: And that date is populated by
12 Qwest?

13 MR. WEEKS: It's an internal date, yes.

14 MR. DELLATORRE: 19, "The work is due date
15 driven, and no preference is given to retail or
16 wholesale orders." The question: What evidence was
17 provided to KPMG to make such a conclusion statement?
18 And we discussed this a little earlier as an example
19 of evaluation criteria 14.7-1-36 where we actually
20 conducted observations in CORAC and watched

21 technicians pulling orders by date, not by the
22 origination point.

23 Question 20, "These orders are loaded to a
24 central office technician as soon as they appear on
25 the DVA report, which is produced regularly

0085

1 throughout the day. No preference is given to retail
2 or wholesale orders." Question: What evidence was
3 provided to KPMG to make such a conclusion statement?
4 Same answer.

5 21, "The difference is that the orders on
6 the DVA list are due present day, or they are past
7 the due date. As DVA reports are generated every two
8 hours, and these orders appear, they are given the
9 highest priority." Question: Please verify, in
10 Qwest M&Ps, are DVA reports to receive the highest
11 priority. KPMG Consulting reviewed Qwest DVA and
12 escalations which state that orders are to be
13 processed by DVA. KPMG Consulting reviewed Qwest job
14 aid CORAC, OQS DVA report and job aid CORAC DVA
15 escalations which state that orders are to be
16 processed by DVA.

17 Question 22.

18 MS. BALVIN: Joe, I apologize. To me a
19 job aid isn't an MPP so the answer is no, but where
20 you did find it was in a job aid.

21 MR. DELLATORRE: Well, we also observed
22 this process in action in addition to reviewing those
23 job aids. So we confirmed what the process should be
24 and then we saw techs doing it.

25 22, "Load specialists spend the majority

0086

1 of their time monitoring WFA-DI to meet their
2 objective of loading provisioning orders the same day
3 they are received. The load specialists are assigned
4 to specific geographic areas, i.e., assigned to the
5 various central offices. They are, in other words,
6 turfed. No preference is given to retail orders
7 versus wholesale orders." What evidence was given to
8 us, and the evidence is the same.

9 Number 23, "Once an order has been
10 completed, the field technician calls the LRAC to
11 request that the load specialist close the order in
12 WFA-C. Alternately, some field technicians are able
13 to enter completion information from the field using
14 mobile devices known as remote access service boxes."
15 When a field technician calls the LRAC to request an
16 order be closed in WFA-C, what is the process for
17 handling such calls via the M&Ps? What percent of
18 orders are closed via a call to LRAC versus that of
19 RAS boxes?

20 (Caucus.)

21 MR. WEEKS: Well, the high level answer to
22 your question is, are these M&Ps, the answer is yes.

23 And I guess I would refer you to the M&Ps and the
24 details if you want to see how all that works. We
25 don't give that in the report. We don't list the

0087

1 individuals in the substantive report. So you can go
2 inspect the M&P and understand what the process looks
3 like. We don't know, because it wasn't relevant to
4 our test, what percentage of them go through that.

5 MS. BALVIN: Actually, what I was
6 attempting to get to was someone could actually
7 call -- a tech could call in and request an update
8 but how rigid are the receivers of that call to
9 actually updating it, whether it's real time on the
10 phone --

11 MR. WEEKS: I understand what you're
12 saying. It's our understanding from reviewing the
13 M&Ps that there is a formal procedure for doing this,
14 that people have been trained how to do it. We
15 watched, I believe -- did we watch this one actually
16 work? Yes, we actually watched this M&P in process
17 so we know that it can work. Now, whether it works
18 100 percent of the time or not, we don't know that
19 from a process test. But it is out there and people
20 have been instructed in how to do this and they're
21 supposed to do it consistently according to the M&Ps.
22 I can't tell you, though, because we didn't collect
23 any evidence, on what percentage go through or don't
24 go through or whatever.

25 MS. TRIBBY: Mike, again a general

0088

1 question. A lot of these responses have to do with
2 what's in the M&Ps and you guys looking at the M&Ps.
3 And you just responded to Liz that she could refer to
4 the M&Ps. As I understand it, most of the M&Ps are
5 confidential and proprietary to Qwest. Therefore,
6 they're not in the work papers, at least not yet.

7 MR. WEEKS: They're in the confidential
8 section of the work papers.

9 MR. DELLATORRE: If they are stand-alone
10 documents that we are able to put into the work
11 papers.

12 MR. WEEKS: But some of the M&Ps, for
13 example, are stored in places like InfoBuddy and
14 things like that.

15 MR. DELLATORRE: And we don't have a
16 physical copy.

17 MS. TRIBBY: Because so many of your
18 conclusions are based on the M&Ps, is there some way
19 that we can get access to the M&Ps that you guys
20 relied upon?

21 MR. WEEKS: We talked about this a lot
22 before the test started, which is what to do with
23 company confidential information. And correct me if
24 I'm wrong here, Andy, Denise or whomever, I believe

25 there is a process that we agreed to ahead of time
0089

1 for CLECs and other parties accessing the
2 confidential portion of the work papers. Andy, I was
3 using your name in vain. I didn't realize you had
4 stepped out.

5 The question that has been asked is what
6 will be the process to have parties, CLECs or
7 regulators, review Qwest confidential documents such
8 as M&Ps. If we say we've reviewed an M&P and an M&P
9 has certain steps or activities in it, we may or may
10 not be in physical custody of those M&Ps. We may not
11 have a copy in our work papers. We've segregated
12 those off into confidential binders and so on but
13 there are restrictions on viewing those confidential
14 binders and we were trying to resurrect with Mary
15 what we agreed to early on as being the techniques
16 that were used to get access to company confidential
17 information. I know we all signed confidentiality
18 agreements and all of that kind of stuff early on.

19 I know there is a position paper, whatever
20 you want to call it, out there on this that I'm
21 trying to remember the details of. Can somebody else
22 bail me out here?

23 MR. CRAIN: I think the understanding we
24 had was that -- are these binders that are backup to
25 the report?

0090

1 MR. WEEKS: Some of the M&Ps were
2 reviewed, we retained copies of and segregated on
3 yellow paper. I remember that part of it. Yellow
4 binders, not yellow paper. And so some are. But
5 there are some of your M&Ps that we didn't have and
6 we didn't keep a copy of so if someone wanted to
7 review it, you would actually have to grant them
8 access to review it.

9 MR. DELLATORRE: As an example, we have
10 had people to come review the M&Ps. They are only
11 given access to the nonconfidential binders. We have
12 confidential binders in our possession that contain
13 those M&Ps that were stand-alone documents that we
14 could take with us. So that's one category of
15 confidential that we have in our possession. A
16 second category are those that are on systems
17 contained within Qwest that we do not have physical
18 copies of but that we reviewed in on-site
19 observations and inspections.

20 MR. WEEKS: And we beat all this to pieces
21 a long time ago and I thought we memorialized it in a
22 document and I just don't have all that committed to
23 memory.

24 MR. CRAIN: I think a lot of that is
25 memorialized in the document. My understanding was

0091

1 that those materials that are backup documents, we
2 could set up a process for reviewing those and make
3 sure they have signed confidentiality agreements and
4 they are bound by that confidentiality agreement we
5 set up. In terms of those things that you've looked
6 at that you don't have copies of, I think we're going
7 to have to address those kind of things on a
8 one-by-one basis as they come up. I really do not
9 have a good understanding of the scope of what you've
10 reviewed and so I think we're going to have to --

11 MR. WEEKS: So what I would suggest, since
12 none of us in the room know the answer to your
13 question, is we'll research what was agreed to ahead
14 of time and we'll make that a TAG call or a focus
15 call so we can all have a common understanding of how
16 we're going to do that. I know we talked about it in
17 theory a long time ago. We're probably getting close
18 enough to where we need to nail it.

19 MS. TRIBBY: I appreciate that. And just
20 a couple of questions. First of all, if there has
21 been a fair amount of information that you've relied
22 upon that isn't available in some kind of hard copy,
23 I would ask that we try to come up with a process
24 other than onesy twosey because if there is a fair
25 amount of volume there, we're probably going to want

0092

1 to be given access to it.

2 The second question I have, as for
3 confidential work papers you all have, my
4 understanding was for the people who signed
5 confidentiality agreements, we would have access to
6 those when we came to review those. That didn't
7 happen when we came to review those. I'm not sure
8 why that's the case or if there is some additional
9 process step we need to go through before we come
10 over the next time.

11 MR. WEEKS: I may have a faulty
12 recollection but my recollection was that those were
13 going to be made available concurrently with the
14 final report as a timing issue. It wasn't an if, it
15 was a when question.

16 MS. ANDERSON: That was my understanding
17 as well. Specifically with regard to all
18 confidential information associated with Os and Es, which none of
19 that would be open until the final
20 report. But this is a slightly different thing when
21 you get into M&Ps.

22 MS. TRIBBY: I guess this is directly to
23 there are work papers right now that we're reviewing
24 that have to do with these discrete reports that have
25 already been issued. There are clearly some yellow

0093

1 paper that relate to that report specifically and
2 when we come to review, for preparation like for this

3 hearing, it would help us to have access to whatever
4 we can earlier rather than later, if that's possible.

5 MR. WEEKS: I know we've talked about most
6 of this. We're going to just have to go do our
7 homework.

8 MS. ANDERSON: Yes. And I just pulled my
9 folder but unfortunately I had the LSR stuff in it
10 and not this document. But I'm with Mike on that.
11 We do have that laid out to some degree. I think we
12 will find that there is maybe a third class of
13 confidential information that is not going to be
14 released at all and that has to do with any of the
15 CLEC specific summaries, interview summaries,
16 information provided by CLECs, that kind of thing.
17 And my recollection is that will never be released.

18 MR. WEEKS: That was my understanding as
19 well. Things like forecasts and things like that,
20 right.

21 MS. ANDERSON: So we'll take this as a
22 combined action item and figure out where that
23 document is.

24 MR. WEEKS: Somewhere in the archives.

25 MS. ANDERSON: And it's in another folder.

0094

1 I know I have it.

2 MR. FINNEGAN: If it will help you, there
3 was a draft work papers approach.

4 MS. ANDERSON: Right. That's where it is.

5 MR. FINNEGAN: And that provided some
6 clarity but not a lot of clarity with the specifics
7 of the M&Ps.

8 MS. ANDERSON: Right. And then we also
9 have to look at the TAG meeting minutes with the
10 discussion of that and there may still be gray areas,
11 of course, but I think we get a fairly decent
12 picture. And if the M&Ps are something that are
13 still hanging out there, then we'll have to address
14 that.

15 MS. TRIBBY: And I guess a related
16 question to that, and maybe you'll find that it
17 requires a request for a modification from us to
18 whatever we decided before but it seems to me that
19 for your benefit as well as ours, if there are
20 confidential papers that relate to the discrete test
21 reports that we're talking about in a forum such as
22 this, then it might be helpful to see those prior to
23 the end of the test.

24 MR. WEEKS: And I'll just give you a
25 heads-up of the kind of problem that faces us. All

0095

1 of our live CLEC observations that we made for things
2 like hot cuts, all of that is in a confidential
3 stand-alone because it's all sorts of customer
4 information through that, names, phone numbers and so

5 on. And I know we could redact stuff like that but
6 that's a lot of labor and a lot of energy and I know
7 he's shaking his head back there. We had
8 conversations about doing that and what that would
9 cost and who would pay for all that and all of these
10 kinds of questions. But there are literally binders
11 and binders of stuff that fall into that category.
12 So this isn't a trivial exercise to just say, let's
13 just go do this.

14 MS. TRIBBY: So maybe we need to limit it
15 to at least initially seeing if the M&Ps can somehow
16 be broken out from the rest of the information.

17 MR. WEEKS: Yes, because from a tester's
18 perspective, I don't know. Qwest does. And I would
19 think Qwest would have to be the party that would say
20 yes or no or what would be the rules or that --
21 because as a tester, we look at it and we just cruise
22 through them just like you would and review them and
23 use them to do walk-throughs and things like that.
24 But there is nothing proprietary to us in those M&Ps.
25 Those are Qwest property. And we'll just have to do

0096

1 that.

2 MS. ANDERSON: And we're definitely taking
3 that as an action item.

4 MR. DELLATORRE: I believe we're at
5 question 24, but that is the same answer as several
6 of the others in that same category, that we
7 conducted observations and reviewed documentation in
8 order to conclude.

9 Question 25 is, when is full
10 implementation of K2 expected? And this is coming
11 from a reference in evaluation criteria 14.7-1-5
12 where we reviewed work presentation systems of K2 and
13 K2 is being rolled out by Qwest. We do not have that
14 implementation schedule information and where that
15 stands right now so we would refer this question to
16 Qwest for additional information or detail on the
17 answer.

18 Question 26 is the 90 percent question
19 that came up before. The 90 percent will go away.
20 It's not a relevant piece of information.

21 Question 27, "If MARCH determines that
22 manual intervention is required..." Please describe
23 how the MARCH system determines the need for manual
24 intervention. And we did not go into that detail
25 because there is a parity by design that the same

0097

1 conditions apply for both wholesale and retail
2 orders.

3 Question 28, and I'm going to try to
4 reduce this on the fly. The question is, are the
5 procedures in the above paragraph documented in Qwest
6 M&Ps? And the answer is no. Software actually

7 drives what the center representatives see. KPMG
8 Consulting verified this through review of business
9 rules.

10 MR. WEEKS: So fundamentally the answer to
11 this question is it's not the M&Ps per se. It was
12 the specifications of the software and we reviewed
13 the specifications for the software that described
14 what was supposed to be the business rule and then we
15 watched the system operate and it appeared to
16 evidence this behavior that's consistent with the
17 specification. So it's not in a written M&P because
18 it's in computer code.

19 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 29. "When
20 changes occur to the M&Ps, RCMAC supervisors send
21 voice mails describing the changes in detail." Did
22 KPMG witness the RCMAC supervisors send voice mails?
23 Response: No.

24 Question 30. When was the QCCC
25 organization established by Qwest? And we would

0098

1 defer that question to Qwest.

2 MR. WEEKS: For those of you who may not
3 have heard, that was Scott Simanson with Qwest saying
4 that it was last July. Also, we would like to point
5 out at this point that this whole section of the
6 report where we're talking about the QCCC and so on,
7 we're going to relocate this section of the report
8 from 14.7 to 14.8 because we think it's a better fit
9 there.

10 MS. TRIBBY: Back on 29, when changes
11 occur to the M&Ps, supervisors send voice mails. You
12 said you didn't witness this. Where did that
13 information come from, then?

14 MR. WEEKS: Interviews.

15 MS. TRIBBY: Thank you.

16 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 31. "The QCCC
17 work flow process begins when a CLEC submits an order
18 that requires coordination. The comments section of
19 a WORD document generated by TIRKS." Please verify,
20 TIRKS systematically generates comments in WORD. And
21 our response is that the WORD doc is generated by
22 TIRKS, not the comments. We didn't mean to imply
23 that the comments section is automatically populated
24 by TIRKS but rather that the WORD document is created
25 by TIRKS.

0099

1 MR. WEEKS: So we'll revise the report to
2 reflect that.

3 MR. CONNOLLY: That's the WORD document,
4 all caps, for the word WORD?

5 MR. WEEKS: Yes.

6 MR. DELLATORRE: 32. "The WORD document
7 comments section specifies whether or not the order
8 requires a coordinated install." Question: What is

9 the indicator populated by a CLEC that TIRKS uses to
10 identify whether a coordinated install is required?
11 And this is not subject to this test. I would
12 probably ultimately refer this to HPC or our order
13 management group and it is not part of the 14.7 in
14 what the actual field population would be from a
15 CLEC.

16 Question 33, "OCO codes are defined in
17 WFA. These codes determine which center will process
18 the orders." And the question is, how are the OCO
19 codes populated? And the OCO codes are populated by
20 specific personnel but they are assigned in the work
21 force administration system. So it's a human being
22 using WFA.

23 33, "An LSR may require multiple
24 provisioning tasks that occur in parallel. All tasks
25 must be completed before the QCCC can coordinate the

0100

1 install." What audit and controls are in place to
2 ensure all tasks are completed such that coordinated
3 installs can occur? And our response is that a
4 person monitors this process and that the system
5 cannot be closed until all of the tests are
6 completed. So the control is it can't be closed down
7 in total until those tests are concluded.

8 35, what tracking mechanism does Qwest use
9 to identify that 30-35 early installation requests
10 occur per day? Our response here really addresses
11 the fact that there are tracking mechanisms rather
12 than validation or confirmation of the 30 to 35 early
13 installs. We are representing something that was
14 presented to us in an interview in the 30 to 35.
15 What we can confirm is that three individuals are
16 assigned to the early installation process but we did
17 not in fact verify 30 to 35 early installs request
18 occurred per day.

19 Number 36, "Orders are coordinated either
20 at the request of a CLEC or as a standard process for
21 certain order types." What order types require
22 coordinated provisioning? It appears as though we
23 may have something removed from the report. The
24 language, or as a standard process for certain order
25 types, should be removed from the report. It doesn't

0101

1 really add. In fact, it adds confusion, I suppose.

2 MR. WEEKS: So just say orders are
3 coordinated at the request of a CLEC, period.

4 MR. DELLATORRE: Correct. 37, "A CLEC
5 requests coordination at the time that it generates
6 an order via the IMA or EDI." Please clarify, IMA
7 means GUI or EDI. As well, are IIS orders excluded
8 from this process? The answer is yes, it does mean
9 both EDI and GUI. And no, IIS orders are not
10 excluded from this process.

11 Question 38, please verify, that KPMG
12 witnessed the documented escalation processes were
13 followed by Qwest QCCC organization. The answer is
14 yes, KPMG conducted observations at the QCCC and
15 observed personnel escalating these orders.

16 39, please verify, missed coordinations
17 are determined by Qwest as CLEC misses by the Qwest
18 QCCC organization. The answer is yes, they are
19 determined by Qwest personnel.

20 Question 40, what is the source for EMAS
21 to collect historical data? The response is, EMAS is
22 linked to the network performance monitor and
23 database which is the data collection system.

24 And the follow-on question is, did KPMG
25 witness Qwest forecast data collection processes

0102

1 surrounding historical product data, market
2 simulation data and industry trends? And this is not
3 in scope for this test. However, later on this
4 afternoon, we will be covering in test 24.4, the CLEC
5 forecasting process, which touches on this in a bit
6 more detail.

7 That concludes the questions for 14.7.
8 Any follow-on questions?

9 MS. BALVIN: My lawyer was speaking to me
10 when you answered question 38 so I didn't hear that
11 response.

12 MR. DELLATORRE: KPMG witnessed the
13 documented escalation processes were followed by
14 Qwest QCCC organization. The answer was yes, we did
15 conducted observations at the QCCC and we did observe
16 center personnel escalating orders.

17 MS. BALVIN: Thank you.

18 MR. CONNOLLY: I have a couple of
19 questions.

20 MR. MAY: This is Geoff May with HP. We
21 had a follow-up question on Worldcom 32 where the
22 question is specify whether or not the order requires
23 a coordinated install. Are you talking there about a
24 hot cut or a cooperative testing?

25 MS. BALVIN: Cooperative testing.

0103

1 MR. MAY: Thank you.

2 MS. ANDERSON: Tim, I think you were
3 talking.

4 MR. CONNOLLY: In the discussion on RCMAC,
5 you mentioned there that the process is primarily due
6 date driven and I want to contrast that with your
7 remarks on the CORAC and the DBA processes which you
8 say are due date driven. What other factors drive
9 this sequencing of orders for RCMAC besides due date?

10 (Caucus.)

11 MR. KONERSMANN: This is Todd Konersmann
12 with KPMG. The maintenance and repair orders would

13 fall into the queue first and then beneath that would
14 be those orders that were required to be processed on
15 the due date.

16 MR. CONNOLLY: So the trouble tickets that
17 had been issued during the day or issued in previous
18 days and are still hot, those would bubble up to the
19 top ahead of today's orders to be completed?

20 MR. KONERSMANN: That's right.

21 MR. CONNOLLY: And any other factors go
22 into that selection process?

23 MR. KONERSMANN: No.

24 MR. CONNOLLY: You also describe -- you
25 mention the K2 system that Qwest was trying to

0104

1 implement. Do you know what its prioritization
2 mechanism is? Do you have access to that?

3 (Caucus.)

4 MR. DELLATORRE: We'll try to address the
5 details of their prioritization scheme but more
6 importantly, and to the point of the process parity
7 evaluation, is that the scheme, whatever that may be,
8 can be applied consistently to two. So in the case
9 of an RCMAC where an M&R can be put in front of the
10 queue, our evaluation is that that is done in a
11 similar fashion for retail and wholesale rather than
12 the specifics of what the prioritization scheme may
13 be, whether it's K2 or RCMAC or any other, but rather
14 that that prioritization scheme is applied evenly
15 between the two. But I think we're trying to get the
16 details for the K2 approach.

17 MR. WEEKS: I think the answer, Tim, is
18 we're not sure of the algorithm K2 uses. We can say
19 it's used the same on wholesale and retail but we
20 don't have a specific enough recollection of exactly
21 how it works that I would want to hazard a guess.

22 MR. CONNOLLY: Thanks.

23 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions? Enjoy
24 lunch. Sorry.

25 MS. ANDERSON: Well, actually, that's

0105

1 where we're headed. And a couple of announcements
2 prior to breaking for lunch. The cafeteria is
3 available and Marie can tell you how to get there but
4 don't go there yet. Just a moment. We have an
5 announcement from the front desk of the Qwest hotel
6 saying that anybody that's planning to stay at the
7 Qwest hotel, if they haven't checked in yet, would
8 you please do so at lunchtime because they're very
9 full and they want to make sure they don't give away
10 your room. So a homework assignment number 1.

11 And then we have additional information
12 regarding lunch, and I know you guys are a big food
13 crowd so I like to get all of these food
14 announcements out. For tomorrow, contrary to what

15 the agenda says, we will be bringing lunch in. Qwest
16 has decided to treat for lunch tomorrow and it will
17 be brought in here rather than going to the
18 cafeteria. But today, the cafeteria is the option.

19 Is there anything else, any other
20 logistics, questions, before we break? We will
21 reconvene at 1:05.

22 (Lunch recess taken from 12:05 p.m. to
23 1:05 p.m.)

24
25

0106

1 AFTERNOON SESSION

2 (1:05 p.m.)

3 MS. ANDERSON: We're going to pick back up
4 with a continuation of addressing the questions.
5 I'll turn it over to Joe. I believe we're going to
6 be starting on 14.8.

7 MR. DELLATORRE: 14.8 is the provisioning
8 coordination process evaluation and I will actually
9 turn it over to Mike to provide a quick overview of
10 kind of the status of the test, as we did on the
11 earlier tests.

12 MR. WEEKS: 14.8 is looking at coordinated
13 provisioning and there are 13 evaluation criteria in
14 that report. At this point, all of those are sitting
15 in a state of satisfied. And so I think essentially
16 most of our work on this process test is done. We've
17 been through the process. We think we understand how
18 it works and we're ready to dive into the questions.

19 MS. ANDERSON: And just before we do,
20 folks on the bridge, a gentle reminder again, please
21 mute your phones. Thank you.

22 MR. DELLATORRE: So we'll start with the
23 Washington state staff questions and given the
24 overview that Mike just gave, that does speak
25 directly to a couple of questions. But the first

0107

1 question was regarding state and/or region specific
2 results. And for this specific task, there was no
3 distinction made by state or region.

4 The second question was an accounting of
5 any open or unresolved observations and exceptions.
6 In this test, there are none.

7 The third question was regarding the
8 revisions to the reports and, as stated earlier, we
9 will be putting out a change log. But in this case,
10 I don't believe there were any material revisions
11 made to the report.

12 And the final question was a discussion of
13 the unable to determine criteria. And again, in this
14 test, there were none.

15 So without any additional questions, let's
16 jump right into the AT&T questions. For number one,

17 KPMG Consulting states, "For those orders submitted
18 utilizing IMA, the CLEC selects an option for a
19 coordinated install. A USOC for a coordinated
20 install is then assigned to the order." This does
21 not clearly identify the similarities or differences
22 in the processes between LSRs submitted via EDI and
23 those submitted GUI. That is an ordering question
24 and not covered here in 14.8.

25 Question 2, KPMG Consulting is currently
0108

1 unable to provide an understanding of CGE&Ys.

2 MR. WEEKS: But we're working on it.

3 MR. DELLATORRE: We went with the
4 presumption that that was a typo. It was intended to
5 mean our understanding of the backup and recovery
6 capabilities.

7 MS. ANDERSON: Busted.

8 MR. DELLATORRE: And actually, in this
9 particular test for those systems and processes that
10 are covered in the 14.8 test, the disaster recovery
11 and security are not part of the scope of that test.
12 In fact, the only test, if I recall properly, that is
13 explicitly covered in meeting disaster recovery is
14 explicitly discussed is the network surveillance test
15 where disaster recovery and how the company rolls
16 over from one center and the like, how they monitor
17 system performance, is our network surveillance and
18 outage test but it is not a scope of this test.

19 Question 3 is a question about language
20 and we have a quote in there using the word bucket,
21 and if that is in fact a euphemism for work queue.
22 And the answer is yes, it is.

23 Question 4, KPMG notes that the DSC has a
24 current compliance rate of 99 percent for orders in
25 today/out today. Is this statistic one that KPMG

0109

1 Consulting calculated and verified, and over what
2 period of time did KPMG Consulting evaluate this
3 level of performance? The answer is no, we did not
4 calculate or verify this number. This information
5 was provided to KPMG during an interview at an
6 observation. However, we were provided with score
7 cards that calculated this number.

8 And in fact, the number that was provided
9 to us for the period of time which were the months of
10 June and July, the compliance rate was actually 97
11 percent versus 99 and we will update this discrete
12 report section to reflect 97 percent.

13 Question number 5 is a similar question to
14 one we've seen earlier with a request for
15 clarification about evaluation criteria. The same
16 answer applies. The evaluation criteria referenced
17 in descriptions and analysis methods and the like are
18 in fact the same evaluation criteria that are

19 detailed or listed specifically individually in the
20 results section.

21 Question number 6, please explain the
22 steps taken by KPMG to evaluate the root cause
23 analyses conducted by the QCCC coaches for missed
24 orders. KPMG Consulting did evaluate the process of
25 coaching and the steps required for missed orders.

0110

1 What we did not examine was how those missed orders
2 were classified as missed orders or not and whether
3 or not those decisions to classify them -- and if the
4 root cause analysis was correct, we did not verify
5 that. We watched the process of training and
6 coaching and that that process did occur as we
7 expected. But we did not then determine whether or
8 not those coaches were appropriately analyzing root
9 cause in the case of missed orders.

10 MS. TRIBBY: Is that something that would
11 be part of another test or not?

12 MR. DELLATORRE: I don't believe so. No,
13 I don't think so. Question 7, please explain the
14 process that Qwest executes to notice the Qwest work
15 centers that need to participate in the daily QCCC
16 missed review status calls. And the process is the
17 coach reviews a paper copy of the missed to determine
18 exactly what organizations need to join on that call
19 and then the coaches are responsible for contacting
20 by phone those centers involved in the miss.

21 Question 8, please describe the testing
22 conducted by KPMG in its review of the supervisory
23 reviews of designers' performance. KPMG Consulting
24 reviewed the artifacts of the supervisor reviews of
25 designers' performance. Specifically, we examined

0111

1 the output of the review such as a quality review
2 checklist that the supervisor goes through with the
3 designers.

4 Question 9, are the completed CLEC case
5 studies, which is a reference from the MTP, available
6 for CLEC review in the KPMG Consulting test records
7 facility in Denver? If not, why? They are or rather
8 will be available, but as part of test 14 because the
9 CLEC case studies is truly our live commercial
10 observation activities.

11 MR. FINNEGAN: Let me ask a follow-up
12 question that wasn't one of the previous follow-up
13 questions. It's in reference to 14.8-6. There is a
14 statement at the very end or a couple of statements
15 at the very end of that page that coordinators are
16 also responsible for DD events, DD meaning the due
17 date, for hot cut orders involving final verification
18 of order status, a precall to the CO, a precall to
19 the CLEC, lift and lay, dial tone verification,
20 notification of completion and order completion in

21 Qwest's internal systems.

22 As part of that, is there an activity
23 involved verifying that any associated LNP order
24 activity by Qwest has been completed?

25 MR. DELLATORRE: We are looking at that

0112

1 specific issue in test 14 rather than here in 14.8.

2 (Caucus.)

3 MR. WEEKS: At this time, sitting here
4 without actually going back and looking at it,
5 subject to check, we think the answer is no, there is
6 no LNP step in the process but we're doing that from
7 memory, so --

8 MR. FINNEGAN: Let me give you some
9 context that will help hopefully in your
10 investigation. There was reference in the discrete
11 report, I don't remember where, that metrics were
12 used by the QCCC and specifically the OP-13A and
13 OP-13B metrics were used. In OP-13A, in order to be
14 completed or considered on time, one of the
15 characteristics on an on time order is complete the
16 Qwest portion of any associated LNP orders. And I'm
17 interested in what linkage there is in the QCCC
18 process to the verification, and indeed things like
19 establishment of the 10-digit trigger, have been done
20 and if the establishment of the 10-digit trigger is
21 not done, do the processes permit the capture of that
22 failure.

23 MR. WEEKS: And since this is an
24 evaluation of the coordination process, I think it
25 would have focused on those activities that involve

0113

1 coordination between the ILEC and CLEC. The LNP
2 activities probably involve Qwest and another party,
3 not the CLEC. So maybe this wouldn't be the place it
4 would be. So order completion I would agree with.
5 Coordination completion, it just makes -- what you're
6 saying makes sense. It may not make sense in the
7 context of the coordination process.

8 MR. DELLATORRE: This is also covered in
9 14, I've just been assured. So I do want to make
10 sure that you will receive more information on this
11 particular subject when we cover test 14.

12 MR. FINNEGAN: And some additional
13 follow-up, the Qwest activity associated with LNP is
14 not coordinated. That's something that Qwest
15 undertakes on their own and there is no way for the
16 CLEC to know whether or not it has or has not
17 occurred. So it's critical that the Qwest
18 processes --

19 MR. WEEKS: The overall Qwest process --

20 MR. FINNEGAN: Has some linkage so it can
21 recognize whether or not that activity has been
22 completed. And it would appear to be in reference to

23 that 14.8, page 6, something that could or could not
24 be part of the due date event.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Scott Simanson is
0114

1 here. He can explain that process if you want.

2 MR. SIMANSON: Basically the process calls
3 for us to validate CLEC dial tone 48 hours in
4 advance. If the dial tone is not there 48 hours in
5 advance, we make a call back to the CLEC to let them
6 know their dial tone isn't there. We check it again
7 one hour before the coordinated cut time and if it's
8 not there, then a decision is made based on that
9 conversation with the CLEC whether or not we are
10 going to reject that order at that point or go ahead
11 and go through the with the cut if the CLEC can
12 convince us that they will be ready by a cut time.
13 And so we know as we cut the customer, unless the
14 CLEC has very distinguished circumstances, the dial
15 tone is there from the CLEC when we do the
16 coordinated cut.

17 MR. FINNEGAN: But I don't understand how
18 that relates to the Qwest establishment of the
19 10-digit trigger. I understand if we fail to set up
20 a dial tone, you have a two-day pre-due date process
21 that verifies that. What's the verification on
22 Qwest's end to ensure that the 10-digit trigger has
23 been set up and provides the context that the failure
24 to do that would be captured as a miss in the OP8
25 format. So if you have an OP8 miss that's associated
0115

1 with a coordinated hot cut, how does the QCCC
2 recognize that the 10-digit trigger has not occurred?
3 There still will be and can be dial tone on the line
4 that shows up on the 48-hour pretest but what process
5 does Qwest have in this --

6 MR. SIMANSON: It's to validate that your
7 number --

8 MR. FINNEGAN: No, it's not our number.
9 The 10-digit trigger tells the Qwest switch -- if
10 there is a call from the donor switch, it trips the
11 trigger to say look at the impact database. If Qwest
12 fails to set up that 10-digit trigger, the call
13 doesn't know where to go and the caller will get some
14 error message that says the line has been
15 disconnected or call cannot be completed.

16 MR. SIMANSON: But as part of the
17 completion process, there is a test call done from
18 not only Qwest but typically the CLEC as well. But
19 the call is able to complete correctly.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: Well, they insist that this
21 only affects a certain type of call. It only affects
22 a call from the donor switch. So we make a test
23 call.

24 MR. SIMANSON: So when we cut a

25 coordinated cut, the CLEC's person is on line, the
0116

1 QCCC person is on line as well as the central office
2 technician are on line, and they all not only do ANI
3 but they also do test calls before the circuit is
4 released.

5 MR. FINNEGAN: All three?

6 MR. SIMANSON: To my knowledge, all three
7 do test calls. We request that. I don't know if the
8 CLEC makes a test call. There is no way for me to
9 know that other than they can take ownership of the
10 order and say we can complete.

11 MR. FINNEGAN: At least from AT&T's
12 perspective, we do make the test call.

13 MR. SIMANSON: I think most of you do.

14 MR. FINNEGAN: But it's not going to be
15 from the CO.

16 MR. SIMANSON: And they're on the line at
17 the time of completion.

18 MR. FINNEGAN: And that's what I would
19 like to have some follow-up on, as to whether KPMG
20 was able to validate that that coordination process
21 step does occur and is documented.

22 MR. WOLVERTON: That validation process
23 step is covered in test 14. We will look at the cut
24 from that perspective. That process is reviewed
25 under test 14.0. We were actually out in the central
0117

1 office in the CLEC observations center as the
2 conversions were taking place. We were observing the
3 coordinating activities between the parties.

4 MR. FINNEGAN: Could you help me
5 understand why it wouldn't be in 14.A?

6 MR. WOLVERTON: That's more of like the
7 test cases that we're talking about. That's the
8 actual observations that we're conducting out in the
9 field. So 14.A is talking more about the process.
10 14.0 is more of a transactionally based test and
11 that's the process that's being followed.

12 MR. WEEKS: If I can put words in John's
13 mouth, I think John's question is, do we know for
14 sure that the process calls for a step that would
15 validate that the trigger had been set? Is there
16 something about the process, some check, some
17 activity, some step that's built into Qwest's M&Ps
18 that would result in checking whether the trigger had
19 been set or not?

20 MS. THIELEMANN: I think the answer to
21 that is we don't know. That's a follow-up.

22 MR. WEEKS: We'll follow up with whether
23 it's specifically identified.

24 MR. FINNEGAN: And thank you for helping
25 me frame the question.

0118

1 MR. DELLATORRE: Other follow-up questions
2 for the AT&T section? Moving on to Worldcom. The
3 first question. I will start with the section of the
4 report, the sentence or two that sort of sets the
5 context. "The provisioning process begins when a
6 CLEC submits an order that requires coordination via
7 IMA." Please verify, IMA incorporates GUI and EDI
8 interfaces. The answer is yes.

9 Number 2. Is there a designated threshold
10 that would trigger a Qwest screener to attempt to
11 renegotiate start times? When an attempt is made,
12 what is the criteria a test screener uses to
13 determine which orders should be postponed? We found
14 out there is no firm threshold. The screener job aid
15 and review does provide guidelines that should be
16 used but there is not a firm threshold.

17 Question 3. Is it the coordinator's job
18 to correct incomplete order information? The answer
19 is no, it is the screener's job.

20 Question 4. "A drop-in is an order that
21 arrives at the QCCC within two days of its due date."
22 How are these orders tagged as drop-in orders? The
23 answer, the orders are tagged, when they go through
24 the screening process, late due to a late design or
25 the order is being held in status. So they're being

0119

1 tagged by the QCCC screener and KPMG Consulting did
2 observe screeners distributing late orders during our
3 observations of the process.

4 Question 5. "QCCC designed services
5 requiring coordination are processed by new loop and
6 hot cut teams. Screeners and coordinators who are
7 members of these teams perform work in the sequence
8 described below." KPMG verified the -- please
9 confirm or please verify KPMG verified the following
10 are documented procedures Qwest employs and that
11 Qwest personnel adhere to those documented
12 procedures. We did verify and confirm these
13 documented procedures and adherence to them and we
14 referenced that in evaluation criteria 14.8-1-1 and
15 in our evaluation measures identified earlier in the
16 report.

17 Question 6, please clarify, is it true
18 that the work groups may not receive the orders until
19 the due date? The answer is yes.

20 Question 7. "RID is the date on which the
21 DSC is to distribute the WORD.doc to the necessary
22 provisioning centers. Generally, the RID occurs on
23 the day after the app date." Question: When do the
24 documented procedures call for the RID to occur? In
25 Qwest's M&P, quote, service interval guide, the RID

0120

1 date occurs two business days after the app date.

2 Question 8. "The coordinator is also

3 responsible for confirming that the circuit meets
4 customer requirements. This is accomplished by
5 verifying that a field technician entered the test
6 results into WFA-C and by cross-referencing actual
7 results against expected results. How is this
8 process achieved? And this process is actually
9 outlined and detailed in Qwest's M&Ps which are
10 embedded in their InfoBuddy system or application.

11 Question 9, "DD events for new loop orders
12 involve final verification of correct order status, a
13 precall to the CLEC for notification of a new
14 install, new installation, CLEC dial tone
15 verification, CLEC notification of completion, and
16 order completion in Qwest's internal systems." For
17 each verification step, what are the systems that
18 require updates?

19 We wanted to make a clarification to that
20 that we don't believe that the systems are updated
21 but rather that they are accessed. So in other
22 words, for the step of correct order status, Event
23 Tracker is the system that is used to obtain the
24 order information. For the precall to the CLEC for
25 notification of a new install, telephone with a note

0121

1 being added to WFA-C is documenting the event. For
2 new installations, Scissor and WFA-DO and TIRKS,
3 WFA-DI, LMOS are the systems that are accessed for
4 that verification step. For CLEC dial tone
5 verification -- excuse me one second.

6 (Caucus.)

7 MR. DELLATORRE: For the CLEC dial tone
8 verification, there is a phone call that's made with
9 a note added to WFA-C. The same is true for CLEC
10 notification of completion. It's a phone call with a
11 note in WFA-C. And for order completion requests in
12 systems, the database is Scissor.

13 Question 10 is a very similar question.
14 I'm trying to see if there are actually any
15 differences.

16 (Caucus.)

17 MR. DELLATORRE: They're the exact same
18 systems and steps taken so rather than going through
19 them all again, it's the same as the one prior.

20 Question 11. What is the tracking
21 mechanism Qwest utilizes to determine how many orders
22 a screener distributes? The answer is that the
23 Scissor system is capable of producing reports as to
24 how many orders are screened per day so the tracking
25 mechanism is actually built into the Scissor system.

0122

1 Question 12, this also is for individual
2 steps. Which systems are updated or accessed and
3 order status Event Tracker, for the precall to the
4 CLEC. It's a phone call and noted in WFA-C. The

5 same is true for CLEC dial tone verification and CLEC
6 notification of completion. And then finally for
7 order completion, it's Scissor.

8 Question 13, how are CRIS errors
9 identified? This is also a background description
10 that falls outside of this process and is more
11 appropriately discussed in the order management
12 section.

13 Question 14, if an order is delayed, the
14 delayed order group notifies the CLEC within four
15 hours. The question is, what audit and controls are
16 in place such that CLECs are notified within four
17 hours? And on page 14.8-8, there is a reference that
18 I would like to point folks to.

19 (Caucus.)

20 MR. DELLATORRE: We would like to clarify
21 our response to question 14. We're not prepared to
22 do so now so we'll get back to this. I'm not sure
23 how we can do that logistically.

24 Question 15. What are the tracking
25 mechanisms Qwest utilizes to measure screeners,

0123

1 coordinators and coaches? And we have, in evaluation
2 criteria 14.8-1-2, we make reference to and observe
3 the performance management process which includes a
4 variety of productivity metrics.

5 Question 16. "To measure a center's
6 ability to process timely and complete orders,
7 coaches must review four orders per person, per
8 quarter, for completeness and timely processing.
9 Coaches are also responsible for performing a root
10 cause analysis for every missed order. Missed orders
11 are tracked and discussed by the QCCC management on a
12 daily status call." Please verify that KPMG
13 witnessed these procedures. And I believe this came
14 up before in the discussion of missed orders. We did
15 review the process of the responsibilities of
16 coaching and that the daily calls did take place and
17 the process for notifying the folks that need to be
18 on those calls, but we did not actually watch one of
19 those review sessions happen.

20 Question 17. "The center also maintains a
21 policy to process orders in today, out today and
22 currently has 99 percent compliance." And we
23 discussed that in the AT&T section, that the
24 information that we received that was an actual
25 compliance performance report for the period of June

0124

1 and July of last year was 97 percent and that's the
2 information that we relied on and represented in the
3 report. We did not verify or validate those numbers.

4 And question 18, "The DSC utilizes the
5 performance measurement process to monitor overall
6 designers' performance. Supervisors are required to

7 conduct two quality reviews for each designer per
8 month. The review consists of going through a
9 quality checklist to ensure that orders are correctly
10 designed, and that the proper supporting
11 documentation was entered into each support system.
12 The PMP also contains attendance and tardiness
13 records. Productivity metrics, in terms of orders
14 processed, vary by designer, and are mostly based on
15 experience level." Please verify, did KPMG witness
16 these procedures? And the answer is yes, we did --
17 KPMG Consulting did observe these procedures with
18 designers at Seattle, DSC implementers in Seattle,
19 DSC designers in Des Moines, DSC implementers in Des
20 Moines, DSC designers and implementers in Denver.

21 Follow-up questions?

22 MS. BALVIN: I didn't quite catch the
23 answer to number 15. I should say I didn't
24 understand the response. If you could just repeat
25 your response, maybe it will click.

0125

1 MR. WEEKS: I think the answer was let's
2 go look at 14.8-1-2, and in there we attempt to
3 describe what we observe as being the mechanisms that
4 are used to do that. So if you want to flip to that.

5 MS. ANDERSON: Page 13.

6 MR. WEEKS: Page 13 in the report, if you
7 want to read through our comments, it describes what
8 we saw and what we believe maps to what you're
9 asking.

10 MR. DELLATORRE: So there are a variety of
11 indicators that we discussed and, in addition to
12 that, we note that individual performance is tracked
13 via quality reviews and coaching and we lay out some
14 of the details of how that process takes place. But
15 it's fairly well described on pages 13, 14 and 15 of
16 the discrete report.

17 Other questions on 14.8? All right. Give
18 us a couple of moments to prepare for test 22, I
19 believe is next on the agenda.

20 (Pause.)

21 MR. DELLATORRE: Test 22, Mr. Weeks.

22 MR. WEEKS: For those of you keeping
23 score, it's 3 to nothing -- no. It's 36 evaluation
24 criteria for test 22 and in terms of kind of where
25 were we in buckets, 33 of those are satisfied and at

0126

1 the time we published the discrete report you have in
2 front of you, we had three in the unable to
3 determines.

4 And Washington state staff has asked us to
5 sort of describe what the reasoning or issues are
6 behind the unable to determines and where we go from
7 here. I'm happy to report that on two of the
8 three -- there are three fundamental areas here.

9 NDR, collo and LIS trunks. On collo and LIS trunks,
10 we have been able to go out and access commercial
11 volume, look at commercial transactions and in the
12 next version of the report that you see will have,
13 rather than unables, will have satisfied.

14 So that will leave us with NDRs still in
15 the unable category and that's because there is
16 fundamentally not any commercial volume for us to
17 observe so we can't do what we can't do. So that's
18 kind of the B-52 level of where are we in the test.
19 So we're sort of through with this test unless
20 somehow in the course of events over the next month
21 or so magically some NDRs take place. And if that's
22 not forthcoming before the end of the test, then this
23 test will move forward to its final with at least one
24 unable.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: And Mary, to your point
0127

1 earlier about the issuance of a revised report that
2 is not directly related to something uncovered here,
3 our intention is to issue a revised report that would
4 address those unables because we've since been able
5 to conduct additional testing that provided us with
6 information on those two.

7 So let's jump right in. For the
8 Washington state staff questions, there was no
9 distinction made between regions and states in this
10 process evaluation. There are currently no
11 unresolved Os or Es. And for questions 3 and 4, Mike
12 just explained that there will be some material
13 revisions to the report that address two of the three
14 unable to determines that appeared in the first
15 issuance.

16 So AT&T question number 1, confirm that
17 the order terminology as applied in this section
18 refers to the network design request. And that is
19 correct. An order is the NDR.

20 Number two is also a terminology question
21 and yes, the word customer is referring to the
22 facilities based CLEC.

23 The same is true for question number 3.

24 Question number 4 is the same answer that
25 we have gone over a few times today about the

0128
1 evaluation criteria in that they are one and the
2 same. The descriptions in the results tables.

3 So question number 5. It is not clear
4 whether KPMG Consulting observed the practice of the
5 error, exception or escalation process by Qwest
6 during the test. First question, please confirm that
7 the processes were reviewed. The answer is yes, we
8 did review these processes. And the second question,
9 please also indicate whether the practice of these
10 was observed. And the answer is yes as well. And

11 then with the specific observations, KPMG Consulting
12 observed the practice of the error, exception and
13 escalation process at the CMPC in Denver. And our
14 report will be updated to reflect this change.

15 Question 6. At the point of the CLEC
16 sign-off, does Qwest consider that the collocation
17 has been accepted by the CLEC? The answer is yes.

18 Follow-up questions to the AT&T section?

19 MR. CONNOLLY: I have a few that were
20 raised in our earlier provided comments on this
21 discrete report and realizing that you hadn't issued
22 another report yet, rather than reasking the
23 question, I'll just go back and ask the same ones
24 again.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: Okay.

0129

1 MR. CONNOLLY: On page 22-4 in the CAR
2 section there, which is the fourth paragraph, there
3 is a notation there -- or your remark is, quote, a
4 CAR permits a CLEC to cease work on a collocation
5 site in progress as well as transfer the
6 responsibility of the collocation site to a CLEC in
7 good standing. And a question was, the, quote, good
8 standing, end quote, of the CLEC is a Qwest analysis
9 and has nothing to do with the regulatory agency or
10 the CLEC or its financial standing or anything like
11 that?

12 MR. WEEKS: Right. And the report is
13 going to be amended to say that Qwest considers it to
14 be a CLEC in good standing.

15 MR. DELLATORRE: So let's move on to the
16 Worldcom section. The first question, was there
17 evidence to support that Qwest supports NDR,
18 collocation and interconnection trunk services to
19 CLECs throughout its 14 state region? The answer is
20 yes.

21 Question 2, "The NDR process starts with
22 the gathering of information regarding a CLEC's
23 desired product offerings. The CLEC must complete
24 the necessary documents or forms that provide Qwest
25 with required information." And the question, did

0130

1 KPMG perform any analysis of the information Qwest
2 required? And the very exact answer is no, we did
3 not provide -- we did not conduct analysis of it.

4 However, we did review the forms, the
5 questionnaires, the CLEC checklist document, the new
6 customer questionnaire form and the interconnecting
7 with Qwest's checklists but we did not go field by
8 field and assess the relevance or pertinence of the
9 questions being asked. And in fact, that same
10 response I will revisit because we have three sort of
11 distinct sections here with NDR, collo and trunks and
12 it's very similar in each case.

13 So then the follow-on question to that is,
14 was the required information provided by CLECs
15 pertinent when it came to Qwest designing, planning
16 and determining the routing in the Qwest
17 switch/network? And we discussed at some length the
18 notion of pertinent. The information is used. The
19 information is required but we didn't want to take a
20 stab in the dark at the numbers, particularly since
21 we didn't go field by field to evaluate the request
22 of content on those forms and checklists.

23 MS. BALVIN: Joe, let me ask, then, what
24 was KPMG's expectation when they did review the
25 forms, each of the individual forms?

0131

1 MR. WEEKS: I think the basic idea was to
2 make sure that there was a process that was
3 reasonably well formed, that someone had thought
4 through what Qwest believed they needed to collect or
5 how they needed to communicate with the CLEC and we
6 didn't jump in, as Joe's trying to indicate, and try
7 to second guess whether all the fields that should
8 have been asked for were asked for or if some of the
9 fields that were asked for were irrelevant. We
10 didn't get into sort of a qualitative, gee, we think
11 that's a cruddy form kind of analysis.

12 What we did do is say, you know, there is
13 a process here, there is a documented process that
14 requires the following forms be filled out. Just as
15 a step in the activity of reviewing the process,
16 we've looked at those forms and understand them and
17 to kind of understand that those forms did exist.
18 And when we went to look at examples. There were
19 examples where people had actually filled out the
20 forms and so on but we weren't so much trying to give
21 a score A, B, C, D to the forms themselves.

22 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 4, please verify
23 KPMG witnessed an end-to-end implementation process
24 for collocation via Qwest documentation and
25 observation. The answer is yes. KPMG conducted

0132

1 tours in each of the offices of the three regions
2 which included reviewing MCI Worldcom's base in
3 Seattle. We also reviewed end-to-end collocation
4 project folders with CMPC project managers, as a
5 cross check or supplemental evaluation of artifacts
6 of the process in addition to observing.

7 At this point, questions 5 and 6 are
8 similar to questions 2 and 3 but rather for the
9 collocation process as opposed to the NDR process.
10 And our answers are the same, that we did assess the
11 requests for information and the population of that
12 information back and forth between the two and that
13 the CLECs and Qwest do work jointly to develop the
14 pertinent information and record. But we did not

15 assess on a field-by-field basis the content of those
16 forms.

17 So then moving forward to question 7, what
18 audit and controls does Qwest employ to ensure that
19 collocation applications are provisioned in a timely
20 manner? There are actually two that the comment
21 applications used to audit and control the work flow
22 of collocation installations and the human being is
23 responsible, the CMPC, for overseeing the completion
24 of those work activities.

25 Question 8, did KPMG review M&Ps

0133

1 surrounding maintenance and repair issues given CLECs
2 are unable to access virtual collocation. And the
3 answer is no. Maintenance and repair and any overlap
4 that may occur here was not part of the scope of this
5 evaluation.

6 Question 9, was KPMG able to witness a
7 cancellation, decommissioning or change of
8 responsibility of a collocation project? The answer
9 is yes. And again, with the two different steps, one
10 of them an observation and one a review of artifacts
11 of the process. In one case, we conducted tours of
12 central offices in Denver, Seattle and Omaha and
13 viewed the cancellation and decommissioned spaces.
14 And in the second, we reviewed cancellation and
15 decommissioned collocation project folders with CMPC
16 project managers.

17 Questions 10 and 11 --

18 MS. BALVIN: Joe, it sounds like you
19 actually looked at the collocation and
20 decommissioning but not necessarily the change in
21 responsibility?

22 MR. WEEKS: You're correct, we did see
23 cancellation and decommissioning. We did not see
24 change in responsibility.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: And questions 10 and 11

0134

1 are similar answers to 2 and 3 where we went through
2 and gathered the documents and forms to see how Qwest
3 and the CLECs interact to offer the NDR products and
4 services and we gathered the various documents like
5 the new customer questionnaire form and the
6 interconnecting with Qwest checklist but we did not
7 assess field by field the content of those requests
8 on those forms.

9 Finally, "Another component evaluated data
10 gathered to determine if essential elements of
11 Qwest's processes and systems are present, and
12 whether or not defined process steps are followed."
13 The question, was KPMG able to determine whether or
14 not the defined process steps were followed? And the
15 answer is yes. This gets back to what we were
16 discussing early on with Mike, that we observed

17 personnel processing both collocation and LIS
18 trunking orders and determined that those process
19 steps are adhered to, but we did not observe
20 personnel processing NDR orders.

21 Other questions on question 22?

22 MS. TRIBBY: Back to AT&T's question 6,
23 I'm just going to follow up on that. This is the
24 CLEC sign-off and whether Qwest considers the
25 collocation has been accepted. On page 22.1, you

0135

1 have a statement in the chart there that says with
2 the collocations acceptable to the CLEC, the CLEC
3 performs a sign-off on the deliverable indicating
4 section. Is there a process, a defined process for
5 that, that all of the CLECs use and that Qwest uses?
6 Is sign-off a term of art there? What did you
7 observe with respect to that?

8 MR. KONERSMANN: What we're referring to
9 here is that point in which the SICM and the CLEC
10 representative go to the collocation site and conduct
11 a walk-through and then they actually sign that
12 acceptance form there. In certain cases, the CLEC
13 chooses not to conduct a walk-through. And in that
14 case, they are required to sign the form as well.
15 And those forms are kept inside the collocation
16 project folders that are maintained at the CMPC's --
17 at the Qwest facility.

18 MS. TRIBBY: Thank you.

19 MS. BALVIN: And Joe, just one more
20 question. I assume the answer is the same but I want
21 to ask it again. When we talk about KPMG being able
22 to identify that these processes were followed
23 through observation, so on and so forth, this was not
24 a blind activity to Qwest?

25 MR. DELLATORRE: When we did the

0136

1 observations, they were not blind. However, when we
2 were reviewing historical artifacts, that certainly
3 by definition were blind because the event had
4 already happened.

5 MS. BALVIN: Thank you.

6 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions on 22?
7 Ms. Anderson, back to you.

8 MS. ANDERSON: Here we are on 24.4. You
9 get another five-minute stretch break.

10 (Recess.)

11 MS. ANDERSON: We're moving on to
12 questions concerning test 24.4, CLEC forecasting.

13 MR. WEEKS: CLEC forecasting has always
14 been one of my favorite tests because it's a process
15 that's doomed to failure before it starts. But we
16 did do a 24.4 CLEC forecasting process review. There
17 were 10 evaluation criteria in that area as of this
18 time. All those are sitting in the satisfied bucket.

19 No, none of them are in any state, so it says on my
20 piece of paper in here. 10 out of 10. So let's jump
21 into --

22 MR. DELLATORRE: Let's go. Washington
23 state questions. There was no distinction made by
24 region or by state. There are no open or unresolved
25 observations or exceptions. There have been no

0137

1 material revisions to the report, although if there
2 had been less than material changes, that will come
3 out on our change log. And there are no unable to
4 determines in this section.

5 We'll jump right into the AT&T section.
6 And the actual question, it appears that individual
7 CLEC forecasts are aggregated by the Qwest
8 interconnect demand analysis with all other CLEC
9 forecasts and provided to the wholesale finance group
10 and the network planning group. Do any of the Qwest
11 groups apply any intelligence to the aggregate CLEC
12 forecast information?

13 I'm sure there are some folks in that
14 organization who would like to address that.

15 MR. CRAIN: I just want the record to
16 reflect that AT&T wrote that comment.

17 MR. DELLATORRE: For example, how would
18 wholesale finance and network planning know if only
19 10 percent of the CLECs provided forecast
20 information? And there is kind of a buyer beware
21 situation here that it's the CLEC's responsibility to
22 participate in this process, is our understanding,
23 and that the CLEC forecasts are one component of the
24 overall forecasting process employed by the company
25 to make decisions around budgeting and network

0138

1 planning. For example, historic growth trends and
2 the forecast numbers in addition to the CLEC
3 forecasted numbers.

4 MR. WEEKS: So I think the question was,
5 if only 10 percent respond, do the other 90 percent
6 not get what they need? I think as much input as can
7 be gained or gleaned from the CLEC community is taken
8 and those who don't choose to participate in
9 providing information, extrapolations based on
10 historical and estimates based on what looks like
11 might happen, are used to fill out the CLEC volume,
12 so to speak, and then that's combined with retail and
13 on down the road.

14 MR. FINNEGAN: Is that something you
15 examined? In the context of the report, it appears
16 to focus a lot of attention on the process of
17 obtaining forecast information from CLECs, the
18 intervals -- the forms they filled out. It didn't
19 appear to spend as much time on what happened once
20 Qwest had obtained those forecasts and whether they

21 applied fudge factors or added to or deleted from the
22 aggregate forecast information.

23 MR. WEEKS: The short answer to your
24 question, yes, we did look at all those things that
25 happened once the CLEC forecasts are in, how they're

0139

1 massaged, how they're compared to previous years, are2 they doing
a good or bad job of guessing what the

3 future will look like and so on. Do you want to
4 elaborate on that?

5 MR. KONERSMANN: They do apply, as I
6 believe is indicated or was indicated by Joe, they do
7 apply trending information, market forecasts and
8 whatever they do get from the CLECs and then
9 aggregate that. We didn't look at the formulas that
10 they would use for those trends and any of the
11 mathematical logic they would add on top of that.

12 MR. DELLATORRE: And I think to your
13 point, John, you're right in assessing or noting the
14 focus of the tests because this is not an evaluation
15 of Qwest's ability to accurately forecast its needs.
16 This is an evaluation of the CLEC forecasting process
17 that Qwest makes available to communicate with CLECs
18 their needs. So that's sort of the distinction.

19 MR. FINNEGAN: And from a gross
20 distinction, too, we're also interested in that Qwest
21 actually did something with the forecast information
22 and they just didn't make us jump through the hoops
23 and then file them to collect dust.

24 MR. WEEKS: The answer is, there is ample
25 evidence to believe they actually tried to pay

0140

1 attention to what you send in. So the better the
2 quality of information you send in then the better
3 the quality of the overall forecasting process.

4 MR. DELLATORRE: These organizations do
5 use the CLEC forecasts as one component. However,
6 the IOF and the SOP groups who use this information
7 did not know how many of the eligible CLECs had
8 submitted forecasts, but they do supplement what CLEC
9 information they have with other information such as
10 we were talking before in comparing historical
11 trends, market intelligence about how things are
12 going. So if in fact only one CLEC submitted orders
13 and the numbers just didn't add up compared to the
14 previous three cycles, that would be noticed.

15 MR. DIXON: Did KPMG quantify how much of
16 the CLEC component made up the forecasts? Was that
17 10 percent of the total forecasts using trends,
18 massaging data, market forecasting? Any sense of
19 that?

20 MR. DELLATORRE: No. That's what Toby was
21 just saying is we didn't actually examine the
22 algorithms that were employed. So then the follow-up

23 question, did KPMG Consulting examine or evaluate how
24 Qwest refines a simple aggregation of the forecasts
25 of less than all of the CLECs to actionable

0141

1 information? I think that's what we were just
2 discussing.

3 Question 2. What role does the circuit
4 administration center play in the CLEC forecasting
5 process? And this is sort of the difference between
6 the internal and external processes. The circuit
7 administration center is not involved in the CLEC
8 forecasting process. The CAC independently
9 constructs a general forecast that defines the
10 anticipated demand on line and tandem switches.

11 MR. FINNEGAN: When you say general, do
12 you mean general, all usage, including retail and
13 CLEC?

14 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes, that's correct.

15 Question 3, please identify the norms,
16 standards and guidelines for the CLEC forecasting
17 review. The norms, standards and guidelines for
18 review, the evaluation criteria that we have listed
19 in the results table, for example, the forecast
20 process responsibilities and activities are defined
21 and documented. It is KPMG Consulting's collective
22 experience and professional judgment that is used to
23 apply these evaluation criteria to the various
24 processes under review. That collective experience
25 comes from not just the testing activities done here

0142

1 at the ROC but 271 testing activities conducted
2 across the country for the past several years as well
3 as the collective industry experience of the
4 personnel and staff that we employ on these testing
5 activities.

6 Question 4 is the evaluation criteria
7 question that we had discussed before, I believe.
8 Yes, these are the evaluation criteria that are
9 actually in the results table that were defined in
10 advance of actually conducting our testing.

11 And question 5, please describe the output
12 of the wholesale finance team's forecast modeling
13 process. Please also indicate whether or not KPMG
14 Consulting evaluated the output. If KPMG Consulting
15 did analyze the output, please describe the analysis
16 and the findings. And as we describe in our criteria
17 24.4.10, that we did assess the existence of the sort
18 of market adjusted aggregate forecast but we did not
19 assess the either current or historical accuracy of
20 those forecasts or the algorithms used to determine
21 the numbers within that forecast.

22 This is a process test to assess the
23 relationship or the subprocesses that exist between
24 the CLEC and the ILEC to enable the inclusion of CLEC

25 forecast information in the overall Qwest forecasting
0143

1 process. On the outside looking in, it seems
2 somewhat unnatural to have the wholesale finance team
3 doing interconnection trunk forecasting.

4 MR. FINNEGAN: Was there anything in your
5 analysis to indicate that it made sense to fall into
6 this group to do the forecasting rather than some
7 network engineering group?

8 MR. DELLATORRE: I believe that for LIS
9 trunks, the wholesale finance group is responsible
10 for securing the funding for the equipment and,
11 therefore, they need to know what the participation
12 rates are from the CLECs in order to be able to make
13 those funding decisions.

14 MR. FINNEGAN: That part I could
15 understand, but I would have expected someone from a
16 network engineering or operations group to say, we
17 need X number of new circuits or additional capacity
18 to satisfy these needs. They would hand that over to
19 the finance group and the finance group would make
20 some determination as to how they would obtain the
21 funds or if they would obtain the funds to support
22 that projected demand.

23 (Caucus.)

24 MR. SCHWARTZ: There are various
25 networking groups involved in the process in terms of
0144

1 looking at new information that's come in and
2 aggregating those forecasts, but remember that from a
3 wholesale perspective, there is certain funding
4 needed for forecasted needs for CLECs. That
5 information is also taken and aggregated with
6 whatever the retail side of the house needs. So
7 there is participation from networking groups and,
8 again, backward trending information for what CLECs
9 have used in the past for network needs.

10 MR. DELLATORRE: I just realized I had
11 failed to introduce our provisioning team before but
12 I'll introduce the RMI team now. Toby Schwartz is
13 our domain lead. To his left is Folake Fabunmi who
14 is the process test lead and to Toby's side is Shun
15 Yeung who I believe helped us with the next test, the
16 24.5 test lead, which we will get to momentarily.

17 MR. WEEKS: So John, did we answer your
18 question? I think the answer was, for the wholesale
19 part of the forecast, which is why the CLEC
20 relationship exists there, that's all rolling up and
21 the finance team is kind of getting what the network
22 engineering folks have said to them and then trying
23 to figure out the money sense side of it and so they
24 are the final end because they write the checks.

25 So I think if what you are trying to imply
0145

1 or infer is that from a roll it up, what do we need,
2 that does come from a network engineer. But then
3 that's taken and combined with how are we going to
4 pay for it, how can we finance it, what can we afford
5 and all that stuff. That's done by the wholesale
6 finance team. And they might come back and say, we
7 don't have the money for that and figure out what
8 they're going to do and not going to do. So from an
9 overall planning perspective, the wholesale finance
10 team doesn't get involved in the retail side of
11 projecting what retail needs are.

12 MR. FINNEGAN: And if I understand the
13 answer, it's helpful to know that it's the network
14 and operations folks that massage the forecast data,
15 so to speak, or work with the forecast data prior to
16 the finance folks getting it and not the other way
17 around.

18 MR. WEEKS: That's what we were trying to
19 say in a roundabout way.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: And if it were the other
21 way around, that might be of more concern. If the
22 finance folks said, here is all you have, now back
23 into a forecast --

24 MR. WEEKS: Like here is your budget, now
25 figure out what you're going to do with it. I'm sure

0146

1 there is some back and forth on that anyway.

2 MR. DELLATORRE: We'll move on to the
3 Worldcom section. Was the requested information from
4 the CLECs pertinent when it came to Qwest's ability
5 to properly size and locate network resources? I
6 think we've been down this path before.

7 And the other question, was KPMG able to
8 determine Qwest employed an end-to-end forecasting
9 process? If so, was KPMG able to witness adherence
10 to this process? The answer is yes, Qwest does
11 employ an end-to-end forecasting process and we did
12 observe adherence to the process. Again, different
13 methods for observing that adherence. For some
14 pieces, actual observation. In other cases,
15 historical artifacts of that process. But again, the
16 limiting factor here is the scope of this test. It's
17 the CLEC portion, the CLEC participation in the
18 forecasting review process, not Qwest's overall
19 forecasting activities.

20 Other questions? All right. Just a
21 moment and we'll get ready for 24.5.

22 (Pause.)

23 MR. WEEKS: 24.5 was the CLEC training
24 review. There were a total of 10 evaluation criteria
25 in this report as well. All of those are currently

0147

1 sitting in the satisfied bucket.

2 MR. DELLATORRE: There were no state or

3 regional differences. There are currently no open or
4 unresolved issues. There have been no material
5 revisions made to the report and there were no --
6 there are no unable to determine results.

7 First AT&T question, provide the
8 evaluation criteria applied to the test. And this is
9 our standard evaluation criteria response.

10 Question 2, KPMG Consulting should make
11 clear the circumstances by which the HPC quality
12 issue was referred to Qwest. Specifically, did HPC
13 utilize the trainee feedback process to identify the
14 needs for hands-on training capabilities? And I will
15 defer to some degree to HPC but our understanding was
16 that this particular case, they may or may not have
17 employed the trainee feedback process but this was
18 brought up in the observation and exception process.

19 MR. MAY: And Joe, can I add to that, we
20 did use the feedback forms but we did not then
21 obviously go and verify that there was some
22 downstream response to the feedback provided.

23 MR. DELLATORRE: So then the follow-on
24 question which will elaborate a bit is what was the
25 period of time between HPC's suggestion and the Qwest

0148

1 response to introduce hands-on training? We felt
2 that because this was raised through the observation
3 process, it may have skewed how this would have been
4 treated had it been dealt with solely through the
5 trainee feedback process.

6 So then that brings me to the next
7 question, which is what observations has KPMG made
8 that showed that CLEC quality control comments are
9 acted upon by Qwest within reasonable periods of
10 time. Well, KPMG Consulting did do observations in
11 addition to the CLEC training feedback and
12 observations of an independent -- an actual
13 commercial CLEC and feedback that it provided through
14 the actual feedback mechanism and that was responded
15 to by the company. Changes were made to training
16 programs according to that feedback within a time
17 frame that was practically identical to the company's
18 response for HPC's requests for changes through the
19 observation process. And I believe that was in the
20 two to three month range from receipt of feedback to
21 implementation of changes to courses.

22 MR. WEEKS: There was a fourth bullet
23 point there, I think, that did HPC make other
24 suggestions using the feedback process and Geoff, I
25 think, answered that one as yes.

0149

1 MR. MAY: Correct.

2 MR. DELLATORRE: So first Worldcom
3 question, what training sources did CLECs, KPMG and
4 HP intend as a means of providing the trainees'

5 perspective? And we do not have a list of specific
6 courses trainees participated in.
7 MR. MAY: Do you want me to give the list?
8 There were 13 courses that HPC attended or have
9 attended to date. And if you want me to list them,
10 there are 13 of them.
11 MR. DELLATORRE: Liz, would you like the
12 actual list?
13 MR. WEEKS: Or can we just E-mail it out?
14 MS. BALVIN: You can E-mail it out.
15 MR. DELLATORRE: The same is true for
16 KPMG. We do have a list of the courses we attended.
17 MS. ANDERSON: Do we just put that list --
18 we could give it to you later, Mary Grace, and then
19 it can be inserted, if that's okay.
20 MR. MAY: That's fine.
21 MR. DELLATORRE: Indulge me momentarily.
22 This won't take long. We only have four classes so
23 we can do this right now. The CEMR classic, and CEMR
24 is C-M-R. CEMR hands-on is two, IMA 7.0 and Qwest
25 101.

0150

1 So then the second Worldcom question, was
2 KPMG able to uncover evidence that determined Qwest
3 supported functionality of procedures for developing,
4 announcing, conducting and monitoring Qwest CLEC
5 training programs? And actually, we were unable to
6 distinguish between the scope of this question and
7 the scope of the test. Liz, maybe you could provide
8 us with a more narrow or enhanced explanation of what
9 you're looking for here so maybe we can respond on
10 the --

11 MS. BALVIN: And actually, maybe my
12 functionality is off but essentially I wanted to see
13 if there were procedures in place that Qwest
14 identified and conceivably documented for the
15 developing, announcing, conducting and monitoring
16 CLEC courses.

17 MR. DELLATORRE: The answer is yes. And
18 we do make attempts to identify throughout the
19 content of the report the various documentation,
20 M&Ps, Web sites, the guidelines and the like. That's
21 a database and several of the management tools, if
22 you will, that provide structure to the process of
23 creating and enhancing the CLEC training program.
24 And as is typically the case, we did observe in
25 action occasionally in some cases and reviewed the

0151

1 actual tools themselves in others.

2 Other questions on the CLEC training
3 program process? Mr. Connolly?

4 MR. CONNOLLY: Thank you, Joe. If I could
5 draw your attention to the last sentence on page
6 24.5-2, it seems that you've applied an odd

7 construction here that we haven't seen in some of the
8 other areas. But here it says KPMG Consulting
9 interviewed KPMG Consulting representatives. Was
10 that necessary because you had people actually
11 attending the training courses who were providing
12 expertise on whether that was a good program,
13 competency and so forth back to the testers who were
14 documenting this?

15 MR. DELLATORRE: There were actually
16 participants who needed the information at the
17 training class versus these folks here who were
18 testing the training process. So there were folks
19 attending the class because they needed to take the
20 class and, therefore, we were able to interview them
21 with their experience without taking the class. So
22 there were two different sets of people. So we were
23 able to interview ourselves in that sense because in
24 some cases, we were using the application and,
25 therefore, legitimately students of the class versus

0152

1 evaluators of the class.

2 MR. WEEKS: I'll make up a hypothetical.
3 Bob Falcone needed to understand IMA in order to do
4 his job of the scheduling of the various releases of
5 scenarios and test cases and so on. He needed to
6 understand how that worked, so he went to the class
7 to understand how the system works. So he was a user
8 of the system just like somebody at HP was who needed
9 to do that because they were going to be actually
10 filling out orders.

11 Toby and his group went and interviewed
12 Bob, hey, Bob, how did you find the class, was it a
13 good instructor. So we have different people who
14 have different roles and different responsibilities.
15 So we actually had people, as is indicated -- the
16 folks who were doing the CEMR work, some of the M&R
17 testing. So the M&R team actually had to go to CEMR
18 class because they had to sit in and do transactions
19 with screeners. Then others went and talked to M&R
20 folks.

21 MR. DELLATORRE: Just as a logistics note,
22 it appears that we are good here. We were, in
23 discussions with MTG, hoping to move forward test 17,
24 to move it up to today so we could cover it now
25 because we do have some extra time and we thought it

0153

1 might be valuable to cover test 17 today and,
2 therefore, maybe realize some gains tomorrow. We are
3 waiting on personnel to show up to assist us with
4 that effort so if I could ask that maybe we could
5 take a possibly extended break to allow for time for
6 those folks to get here and we'll resume.

7 (Recess.)

8 MS. ANDERSON: We're going to move on now

9 to test 17 and before we go there, we have a
10 follow-up item from HP on 14.7. This had to do with
11 Worldcom's question number 32. Worldcom better look
12 out over there.

13 MR. MAY: This is Geoff with HP and if I
14 incorporate your clarification into the question, I
15 restate the question as, what is the indicator
16 populated by a CLEC that TIRKS uses to identify
17 whether a cooperative test is required. And our
18 answer is, it is field 18-A and it's called test.
19 And you would put that on the coordinated hot cut LSR
20 and you can populate it or not populate it at your
21 discretion.

22 With regard to what TIRKS uses to identify
23 whether a cooperative test is required, HP wouldn't
24 have any visibility into what's essentially a
25 question about Qwest's systems. So we would defer

0154

1 that to the back of the room. That's it.

2 MR. DELLATORRE: I also have a follow-up
3 response for the test 12.7 discussion from this
4 morning that, if recollection serves, was raised by
5 Tim Connolly with AT&T that was a discussion of the
6 various figures that we presented the work flows
7 comparing the retail and wholesale loop qualification
8 systems processing and the role the F&S plays in that
9 process. And if I could draw folks' attention, for
10 those of you that have a copy of the discrete report
11 for 12.7, in figure 12.7-1 and figure 12.7-2, because
12 I would like to discuss what the distinctions are
13 between those.

14 First, the acronym DA stands for data
15 arbiter and the acronym SIA stands for safe
16 information access. What I would like to draw
17 attention to is in figure 12.7-1, you'll notice that
18 F&S, as we described before, that it serves to move
19 data back and forth between one system and the next.
20 And in the retail process, it sits between the Q City
21 and the QSERV databases or applications. But F&S is
22 between those two. And the question essentially got
23 to why that was different in a wholesale section.

24 If you'll note down this center column,
25 and I'll make that clear momentarily, of the 12.7-2

0155

1 process, you'll see that IMA in the middle feeds to
2 F&S which then feeds to QSERV. This is the process
3 flow and you'll notice it's the same process flow as
4 the first figure for retail. That process is for
5 resale so that the resale process and the retail
6 process follow a very similar or a very -- yes,
7 similar is correct. Rather than starting in Q City,
8 it starts with IMA because that's the access point.
9 But then it goes through F&S as a mover into QSERV.
10 So straight down that column in the middle of the

11 figure is the resale process which is the equivalent
12 to the Q City F&S QSERV of the retail process.

13 Now, if we move over to the most right
14 column of figure 2, you'll note that the F&S is
15 between IMA, the F&S DA. And then beneath that, F&S
16 SIA is between IMA and facility check and LFACS. And
17 again, the process is very similar. However, the
18 nature of the products being offered require that F&S
19 sits between two different systems rather than Q City
20 and QSERV because these are facilities based, as
21 opposed to resellers. You need to do facilities
22 checks. And therefore, F&S sits between the two in
23 that case.

24 So there are three conditions that are
25 being described here. Retail in the first figure and
0156

1 then resale and facilities based in the second
2 figure. The resale is the logical -- is logically
3 identical to the retail and the difference that
4 occurs from the facilities to the resale or the
5 retail is because of the nature of the product that
6 you need to perform the facilities checks and that's
7 why the process diagram for the wholesale section
8 appears to be different from the retail section.

9 MR. CONNOLLY: Is it also -- should this
10 12.7-2 on the right most side, the upper quadrant, if
11 you will, should that be read to be loop
12 qualification done on the basis of street address?

13 MR. WEEKS: I'm not sure we know the
14 answer to that question.

15 MR. DELLATORRE: Brad will come up and
16 join us, who is our subject matter expert in this
17 areas .

18 MR. STUBER: Premise uses address and/or
19 TN.

20 MR. CONNOLLY: I was hoping to find that
21 the upper part was for address based and lower part
22 was for TN based.

23 MR. WEEKS: So if I can do address or TN
24 up here, under what circumstances do I come back
25 here?

0157

1 MR. DELLATORRE: So the upper portion of
2 this process flow is IMA up to a validating address
3 when that's appropriate. If not, then it goes from
4 IMA down through the facilities check to validate the
5 facilities are correct.

6 MR. STUBER: And the F&S just allows a
7 translator, allows the two systems to talk to each
8 other in either case.

9 MR. CONNOLLY: That's helpful. And my other question
on the level of detail in 12.7-1, is
11 the data arbiter of F&S or the, I think you said safe
12 information architecture?

13 MR. STUBER: It's just request DSL retail.
14 SIA is replacing F&S. F&S is going away. SIA is
15 going to be replacing F&S, doing the same functions
16 though. Data arbiter is also going away.

17 MR. DELLATORRE: In both the retail
18 process flow and the resale process flow, it will
19 read at some point Q City SIA QSERV or IMA SIA QSERV
20 because the interface of course is different. The
21 middle data mover kind of thing is the same and QSERV
22 is the same.

23 MR. CONNOLLY: Thank you for clarifying
24 that.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: You're welcome.

0158

1 Fortunately, I was just reminded to introduce our M&R
2 team. Russ Guzdar in the center right behind me is
3 our M&R domain lead. And to Russ' left is Nolan
4 Dinsmore, one of our subject matter experts in the
5 M&R domain. And John Deahl is to the right, the M&R
6 liaison. And many of you will know John from a
7 number of the calls and participation throughout the
8 course of the test. We'll jump right into test 17.

9 MR. WEEKS: Test 17 was trying to look at
10 EB-TA that often use electronic bundling interface
11 for trouble reporting and management. And it was a
12 functional evaluation to kind of bring everybody back
13 to sort of what we were trying to do there. There
14 were eight overall evaluation criteria, all of those
15 currently sitting in the satisfied bucket.

16 MR. DELLATORRE: The Washington state
17 staff questions. No regional or state specific
18 testing, no open or unresolved observations or
19 exceptions. There were changes made that I do not
20 believe have been reflected in a public version yet
21 but we will discuss those changes here and as
22 discussed earlier, we'll be getting a change log
23 together. And there were no unable to determine
24 results associated with this test.

25 So let's begin with the AT&T questions.

0159

1 How was the joint implementation agreement between
2 the test CLEC and Qwest translated into expected
3 behavior? Our answer is that the final report, table
4 17-1, which are test scenarios, were designed and
5 developed from a review of the JIA documentation as
6 well as the ANSI standards that not only the
7 individual CLEC JIAs but also the Qwest standard
8 template JIA are developed and relied on.

9 Question number 2, identify the
10 documentation that lists the expected behavior of the
11 EB-TA interface. And again, that is a combination of
12 the test CLEC and Qwest joint implementation
13 agreements as well as the ANSI standards that those
14 are based on.

15 MR. FINNEGAN: Can I go back to the first
16 question to clarify? My memory serves me you
17 referenced table 17-1 as how that was translated into
18 expected behavior.

19 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: That looks like
21 transactions to be done. It doesn't get to the level
22 of what the behavior for the transaction would be.

23 MR. WEEKS: And I think the answer to your
24 question is behavior kind of has -- we had the same
25 conversation when we were trying to think about how

0160

1 to answer your question and what we decided is
2 behavior has both aspects to it. It has the behavior
3 of -- what are the basic features and functions that
4 are supposed to be there. The system is supposed to
5 be able to allow a destruction or whatever. That's
6 part of the definition of the behavior. That's sort
7 of the whats. And then there is the hows, how should
8 it add work or something like that. And the answer
9 to that is more in the ANSI standards and the flow
10 patterns than it is in the JIA itself.

11 MR. FINNEGAN: So would that cover
12 something like an intentionally induced error on a
13 transaction, you're trying to get it to fail, your
14 expected behavior would be this type of ANSI
15 response?

16 MR. WEEKS: Yes, there are lists -- as the
17 JIA references and as the standard articulates, there
18 is a set of sort of legal responses in any context
19 that are articulated in there and so what you would
20 do when you presented an error -- this really goes to
21 any system but specifically it applies to this one as
22 well. There is a well-known, well-documented set of
23 responses that are legal responses to get in
24 situations. So we would pump an expected error in
25 and if a meaningful relevant legal error message

0161

1 comes back, then we say the system is behaving the
2 way it should.

3 MR. DELLATORRE: Question number 3, what
4 were the intentional errors that were introduced into
5 the EB-TA transactions? And the errors are noted in
6 table 17-1 that you'll be aware that there are two or
7 three different categories ticked off in this matrix.
8 Some have Xs, some have Xs and asterisks. Those that
9 have the asterisk are the functional category or the
10 order type, the ticket type, trouble type that we
11 submitted with known error conditions on. So where
12 you see an X with an asterisk -- for example, test
13 number 3 was a create trouble for business POTS and
14 that was done both in error free and error
15 conditions.

16 MR. FINNEGAN: Could you please describe

17 the nature of the errors? Were there errors of
18 omission, were there errors where you put incorrect
19 information?

20 MR. DELLATORRE: Sure. I can go through
21 an example of the error types. And in fact, I can
22 fairly extensively, if you would like to continue,
23 create -- execute on a circuit with an open trouble.
24 A modify using an invalid circuit ID. An add
25 transaction after the ticket is in a cleared state.

0162

1 A create executed with an invalid circuit number. An
2 add transaction immediately after a create within
3 sufficient time to process, et cetera. So we did
4 have known error conditions going in around those
5 types that are in the --

6 MR. WEEKS: The next one which he's going
7 to read, create a transaction without a valid trouble
8 type. So I think the answer to your question is we
9 tried to do some combination of leave fields blank
10 that were required fields, put in erroneous values
11 for fields that are a well-defined set of values.
12 Those kinds of what I'll call data entry type of
13 errors. But also sort of protocol errors which were
14 do things out of sequence or do things out of the
15 definition of the protocol. So I think we tried to
16 bang at some of all of those.

17 MR. FINNEGAN: Violation of business
18 rules?

19 MR. WEEKS: Right, violation of the
20 protocol. I don't know if those are all business
21 rules but --

22 MR. DELLATORRE: And then our response to
23 table 4 is essentially the same. What were the
24 intentional errors that were resubmitted without
25 correction after receiving an initial error message.

0163

1 And they fell within the categories that have the two
2 asterisks.

3 Question 5. Three criteria type,
4 existence -- these are actually measures, I believe.
5 Existence, qualitative and parity. And the test
6 report states, "The functional evaluation tested each
7 of the EB-TA functional processes against a single
8 criterion, defined as the presence of functionality."
9 Did KPMG Consulting test applying the criteria of
10 qualitative and parity? In fact, they all were
11 tested.

12 The way we segmented those, though, were
13 that criteria 1 through 7 were a combination
14 assessment of functionality as well as a qualitative
15 assessment and all of the parity was aggregated into
16 criteria 17-1-8. And that is something that
17 apparently you all do not have. Therefore, it will
18 be coming out in a revised -- oh, it is out.

19 So let me be clear again. The parity
20 measure was captured in one criteria, 17-1-8, and
21 apparently that was not contained in the original
22 release but then subsequently contained in a revised
23 release.

24 MR. WEEKS: February 13. Are you looking
25 at the right version?

0164

1 MR. FINNEGAN: I am looking at the
2 February 13 version.

3 MR. WEEKS: So 1 through 7 in the
4 evaluation criteria, so pages 7 and 8. Criteria 1
5 through 7 are both existence and quality and criteria
6 dash 8 is where we did parity.

7 MR. FINNEGAN: Some clarifying questions
8 to make sure I'm calibrated on terminology. In the
9 criteria type, you described them as measures.

10 MR. WEEKS: Yes, the criteria type. It's
11 page 78 in MTP. If you go to 17.4 test scope with
12 trouble reporting, it shows a different set of
13 processes. And on the right-hand side, it shows
14 criteria type.

15 MR. FINNEGAN: I've got a different
16 pagination.

17 MR. DELLATORRE: I apologize. It's
18 formally titled criteria type, not measures. So your
19 reference was correct, from the MTP.

20 MR. WEEKS: So the existence and
21 qualitative criteria type are contained in evaluation
22 criteria dash 1 through dash 7, and the parity
23 criteria type is contained in the evaluation criteria
24 dash 8.

25 MR. FINNEGAN: So that the bottom line is

0165

1 you did look at all three criteria types?

2 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes.

3 MR. WEEKS: Yes.

4 MR. DELLATORRE: And in fact, let me offer
5 the rationale for separating them, briefly. Because
6 we were looking at different functionality types that
7 creates, adds and modifies, we were looking for the
8 functionality on an individual transaction basis,
9 whereas a parity measure is something that kind of
10 spans each of those functionality types and it's a
11 systems based evaluation, which is why we were able
12 to aggregate that in one criteria versus assessing
13 the functionality, the availability, the correctness
14 of each individual transaction type.

15 MR. FINNEGAN: So the statement, the
16 functional evaluation tested each of the EB-TA
17 functional processes against a single criterion
18 defined the presence of functionality --

19 MR. WEEKS: We'll rewrite that.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: It is an understatement?

21 MR. WEEKS: It is an understatement. It
22 was at least true but it wasn't comprehensive.

23 MR. DELLATORRE: Question number 6 is our
24 sort of standard answer on the evaluation criteria,
25 that those are in fact the criteria in the results

0166

1 tables.

2 Question number 7, explain why KPMG
3 Consulting applied a statistical test to the
4 application of a benchmark standard as contrasted
5 with, quote, stare and compare. In this case, the
6 description of this gets to several questions that
7 were discussed as well as one of the Washington state
8 questions about changes to the report. So I will
9 defer to Mike to begin this discussion.

10 MR. WEEKS: What we discussed and as Joe
11 is alluding to kind of the answer to 7, 8, 9, 10, are
12 all wrapped up in one issue. During the time that we
13 were conducting this test, the interface between the
14 test CLEC and Qwest experienced problems. We would
15 submit things and things would time out. We wouldn't
16 get responses back when we thought we would
17 sometimes.

18 We looked behind the scenes to see if
19 those troubles were actually recorded in the system
20 and it's just that responses were missing or had they
21 ever been actually recorded in the system at all and
22 so on. Qwest then, and the test CLEC, went through a
23 great deal of work to analyze why these things were
24 missing and what appeared to be the problem. And
25 it's our understanding that both parties agreed that

0167

1 the interface on the test CLEC side at the time was
2 experiencing instability. And in fact, that same
3 instability we know for a fact was visiting itself
4 not only on Qwest but on another ILEC as well because
5 we were doing similar testing with that same
6 interface at another ILEC and we were seeing exactly
7 the same problems.

8 And so we sort of had this choice of how
9 do we count these things that didn't happen right,
10 the time-outs and the things like that. In the
11 version of the report you're looking at, I think it
12 calls for like 34 out of 36, two of the kind of
13 responses that were missing in action. Let me tell
14 you what we did and why we decided to change our
15 mind.

16 We originally decided that if we could see
17 evidence in the system that the trouble ticket had
18 been recorded, we would sort of could count that, if
19 you will, in Qwest's favor. But if we didn't see any
20 evidence that it had been recorded in Qwest's
21 systems, we would sort of count that against Qwest.
22 And that's why they got 34 out of 36. And that's why

23 if you do the 34 out of 36 and you do the stare and
24 compare, you get a fail, not a pass.

25 The more we've talked about that and the
0168

1 more that we think about that -- now, this is a
2 feature function test. You only need a handful of
3 transactions to say, does the functionality work, yes
4 or no. This isn't a performance oriented test where
5 we've got to get to some statistically significant
6 sample size and we have to worry about P values and
7 all these sorts of things.

8 So what we made the decision to do, and we
9 think it's fairest to everyone involved, since there
10 were known problems on some of the observations that
11 originated not with Qwest but with the test CLEC,
12 we're throwing those out. We're throwing those
13 observations out as saying it wasn't a fair test
14 because of the instability on the CLEC side.

15 So those are being thrown out all together
16 and, therefore, the things that were marked as you
17 examined the work papers, you were having trouble
18 mapping why the time-outs listed in the work papers
19 didn't match with the time-out counts. We're
20 throwing all the time-outs out and we're going to
21 base our information on the results that we got when
22 it appears to be that the test CLECs interface was
23 stable because that's the fairest way to make a good
24 evaluation of the functionality of Qwest's interface.
25 And so we're going to be revising this report to

0169
1 reflect that. We're throwing out all of these
2 questionable observations.

3 MR. FINNEGAN: So if I understand the
4 time-outs of the transactions that were in the
5 document viewing room, all of the ones that timed
6 out, the attribution was the stability on the test
7 CLECs?

8 MR. WEEKS: Any interface -- which it's
9 our understanding both the test CLEC and Qwest have
10 mutually agreed were on the test CLEC side.

11 MR. FINNEGAN: And the backup
12 documentation supporting that, was that considered
13 confidential?

14 MR. WEEKS: Do we have any backup
15 documentation on that? We don't have any documents
16 that support those assertions. So we have
17 meetings -- so the answer is those are observable and
18 are confidential.

19 MR. FINNEGAN: Just to get calibrated,
20 there is a little box in the bottom right-hand corner
21 of the chart that says where there were a number of
22 test instances that failed, where the box was checked
23 and where there is a time-out associated, generally
24 was the failure a result of the time-out?

25
0170

MR. DELLATORRE: That speaks to the last

1 bullet point on question number 10 where in fact we
2 did have some boxes incorrectly marked by our testers
3 that did not ultimately affect our total counts or
4 final results because we didn't rely on that box to
5 come up with our numbers. However, your observation
6 is completely correct and we're going back into the
7 work papers to revise when in fact the tester made a
8 mistake in checking or not checking the box.

9 MR. FINNEGAN: So once that's corrected,
10 if you were to review the work papers again, this
11 would be a case where absent the knowledge that there
12 was instability on the test CLEC's interface, if a
13 time-out had occurred, would that time-out have been
14 a cause for a test case failure?

15 MR. WEEKS: Yes. If we didn't get a
16 response back, then we would have considered that to
17 be dysfunctional. We would have asked the parties to
18 investigate that and we would have looked for root
19 cause.

20 MR. DELLATORRE: But that is hypothetical
21 or speculative because we did have the knowledge of
22 the fact that the environment was --

23 MR. WEEKS: But to answer John's question,
24 if when we did the test, and -- if we did the test
25 and we sent the transaction in and we got the

0171

1 response back in a timely basis and we had our work
2 papers, then you would get a good result on there.
3 Had there been -- but I don't believe there were any
4 cases where the interface was working properly and
5 the system timed out, but had that happened, then
6 yes, that would have been counted against Qwest, so
7 to speak, if it was their fault, root cause.

8 MR. FINNEGAN: Did you know the
9 instability of the system prior to doing the test or
10 was it a case where you got a time-out and you marked
11 the box test failure, went to Qwest and the CLEC and
12 said, hey, what's going on here, they came back and
13 said, well --

14 MR. WEEKS: It was both. We were
15 contemporaneously aware that there were problems with
16 this interface.

17 MR. GUZDAR: We actually tried testing
18 this twice beforehand and it wasn't working correctly
19 at that time. So this was the third try that we had
20 actually tried, so we had known about the problems in
21 advance.

22 MR. DELLATORRE: Without going through
23 them too quickly, John, please, if you would like to
24 visit 8 or 9 in any more detail, but the response
25 there really does address each of those through to

0172

1 question 11, given that one additional piece of
2 information that the boxes were incorrectly marked.

3 So question 11, why were screen prints
4 provided for some test case instances in test 17
5 binder B but not provided for others? And that is a
6 situation where we are dependent upon, in this case,
7 the test CLEC, sometimes just commercial data, and we
8 were not provided with all of the screen prints and
9 you cannot go back and get -- you cannot recreate
10 that information after the transactions expire.

11 And now for questions 12, 13, 14, 15, the
12 concept is the same on all of them. I'll read 12.
13 For the create trouble ticket test case instance, and
14 there is a file name, an error message of "2:
15 Circuit mismatch" was received. This test case
16 instance showed no failures in the number of test
17 instances failing box in the KPMG Consulting trouble
18 ticket entry form. Was a circuit mismatch error
19 message the expected response for this transaction?
20 And our answer is yes, this was appropriate and per
21 the JIA.

22 MR. WEEKS: This gets back to the answer
23 earlier about the sort of approved lists of message
24 types that you can get in response to a request.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: And the difference

0173

1 between questions 12, 13, 14 and 15 is the specific
2 error message in question. Cannot perform cancel
3 request, trouble report change denied, ticket status
4 is cleared, et cetera, that we received different
5 error messages on different transactions and each of
6 those error messages was in conformance with the
7 error messages articulated on the JIA.

8 And then finally, question 16, why was
9 there no KPMG Consulting EB-TA trouble ticket entry
10 form test CLEC for a particular test instance in a
11 particular work paper binder? And that was just a
12 miss, that we did not print it and put it in there.
13 So it has since been printed and reinserted into the
14 new work papers. So thank you, Mr. Finnegan, for
15 cleaning up our work papers.

16 MR. FINNEGAN: I just don't want that
17 construed as auditing the auditor.

18 MR. WEEKS: Well, we don't want to get a
19 bill for it.

20 MR. DELLATORRE: On to the Worldcom
21 section. The preface is, in relation to EB-TA
22 gateway and the JIA, please clarify the specific
23 features, functions and business rules agreed to by
24 the parties resulting from what Qwest is willing and
25 able to support? And our response is, Qwest provides

0174

1 a standard JIA template which describes the initial
2 functionality. Desired changes in functionality can

3 be negotiated via the change control process outlined
4 in the JIA. We did not participate in or observe the
5 change control process in JIA within the scope of
6 test 17.

7 Second question. To what extent did KPMG
8 assess Qwest's EB-TA testing procedures? The testing
9 environment and testing of this particular interface
10 is not in the scope of test 17. We did not assess
11 its --

12 MS. BALVIN: This actually will come out
13 in another subsequent test report, will it not?

14 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes. And in fact, I
15 believe there is an open exception on EB-TA.

16 MS. THIELEMANN: There is. It will be in
17 test 24.6 and there is an exception, 31.09.

18 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 3, specifically
19 which AVC messages require manual intervention and
20 which ones are automatically generated by Qwest OSS?
21 And this is a black box test from the outside that we
22 submit the transaction -- submit the trouble and
23 receive the response. And we did not examine how
24 those responses were generated.

25 Question 4, did KPMG determine the

0175

1 existence of qualitative parity per the MTP? I think
2 we can use a little bit of an explanation or -- what
3 we were trying to get to there, and maybe we can
4 explain it a little better. As I noted before, the
5 two criteria types, functionality and qualitative
6 assessment, were covered in the criteria 1 through 7
7 and the parity portion of the evaluation was covered
8 in criteria 17.1-8. And we weren't sure on the
9 question so if some follow-up is necessary, please
10 let us know.

11 MS. BALVIN: Specifically, I was trying to
12 get to how quickly Qwest can open up the mechanized
13 loop -- excuse me -- Qwest can actually process a
14 mechanized loop test versus a CLEC. Because
15 Worldcom's experience has been that we have a delayed
16 ability to perform mechanized loop testing.

17 MR. WEEKS: I think our answer to this is
18 that we were looking for functional equivalency. We
19 did do performance tests to determine whether the
20 level of service delivered every day, all day through
21 EB-TA is the same or different from any of the other
22 mechanisms in wholesale or retail for turning in
23 trouble tickets.

24 MR. DELLATORRE: It's important to note,
25 because the test for CEMR is different. So in this

0176

1 particular case, we did not evaluate something like
2 timing of the parity and the timing of the responses
3 between retail and wholesale.

4 MS. BALVIN: But you will with CEMR?

5 MR. GUZDAR: With CEMR, we did a
6 performance test where we used benchmarks created on
7 our part but not retail. We didn't use retail on the
8 benchmark.

9 MR. WEEKS: I'm not aware that there is a
10 functional equivalent in retail to EB-TA. I don't
11 think the reps are using electronic bonding
12 interface. I think they're using something that's
13 more like CEMR and less like EB-TA. I don't think
14 there is an application that retail reps write that
15 uses the same interface to turn in trouble tickets.
16 I think they use a different mechanism.

17 MR. DELLATORRE: And with CEMR, the
18 evaluation of CEMR is a performance evaluation. So
19 what Russ was getting at was there are benchmarks and
20 standards that we're evaluating the performance
21 against. It is not a parity evaluation. So we don't
22 then go take those performance results and compare
23 them to parity.

24 MR. WEEKS: I don't think there is
25 anywhere in the test where we get at what you're

0177

1 trying to get to.

2 MS. BALVIN: Let me make sure I asked my
3 question clearly because I don't think I understand.
4 It seems as if KPMG did not do an analysis of how
5 quickly Qwest and a CLEC can open up a trouble ticket
6 at least for EB-TA.

7 MR. WEEKS: That is correct. That is also
8 true for the CEMR test.

9 MR. DELLATORRE: Right. There is no --

10 MR. WEEKS: We did not compare to retail
11 for timing. In EB-TA, we compared for functionality.
12 Can I do the same things functionally in EB-TA that I
13 do as a retail rep. So we looked for functional
14 equivalence. We did not look for timing equivalence.

15 MR. GUZDAR: That was based on the JIA.
16 So the test CLEC negotiated a JIA. So the test CLEC
17 could have negotiated some functionality in or out
18 that we may not have.

19 MR. WEEKS: Or vice versa.

20 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions for test
21 17?

22 MS. ANDERSON: Any other clarifying
23 questions or questions at all about any of the
24 sections today? I think at this point, the plan is
25 not to go forward with the next one.

0178

1 MR. DELLATORRE: Correct.

2 MR. WEEKS: That's correct.

3 MS. ANDERSON: We're going to call it a
4 day. So we're going to adjourn for today. A couple
5 of reminders for tomorrow. First of all, the correct
6 conference code. Sorry about that. It is 9432478.

7 We're going to start at 8:30 tomorrow and if we go
8 into the afternoon, we will have a hard stop at 3
9 o'clock because we know people have flights and
10 things and so anything we don't cover then will be
11 handled as follow-up.

12 We will be having lunch brought in as we
13 announced earlier, into this room, and we will have
14 some folks breaking off during that lunch break for
15 an executive committee call. Many of the folks here
16 have to join that call.

17 MR. WEEKS: So we won't not work through
18 lunch?

19 MS. ANDERSON: We won't work through
20 lunch. We get to enjoy each other's company.

21 Any questions before we break for the day?
22 Good night, folks.

23 (The proceedings adjourned at 3:56 p.m.)

24
25