

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 Tuesday, March 5, 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

JEANMARIE STURM

11 SCOTT SIMON

12 KPMG

BEN HEMPHILL

13 BRADLEY R. STUBER

CARRIE THIELEMANN

14 CHUCK WOLVERTON

FOLAKE FABUNMI

15 JOE DELLATORRE

JOHN DEAHL
16 JULIANA A. BARTRA
LIZ FUCCILLO
17 MICHAEL BUJAN
MIKE WEEKS
18 NOLAN DINSMORE
RUSS GUZDAR
19 SHUN YEUNG
TOBIAS D. SCHWARTZ
20 TODD M. KONERSMANN
BRIAN T. RUTTER
21 STEPHEN SESKO
TERRY TRUDGIAN
22 VAN HOWARD
23 NORTH DAKOTA COMMISSION
BILL BINEK
24 PATRICK FAUN
25 MONTANA COMMISSION
KATE WHITNEY

0003

1 APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2 MTG
ROBERT M. CENTER
3 DENISE ANDERSON
MARIE BAKUNAS
4
LIBERTY CONSULTING
5 BOB STRIGHT
6 NEBRASKA COMMISSION
BUSTER GRIFFING
7
NEW MEXICO COMMISSION
8 ANTHONY MEDEIROS
9 OREGON COMMISSION
IRV EMMONS
10
QWEST
11 ANDY CRAIN
BARB BROHL
12 CHERIE AXLEROD
CHRIS VIVEROS
13 GARY WOODSIDE
JACKIE DONALDSON
14 KRISTIN PROVOST
LUCY HIGLEY
15 LYNN NOTARIANNI
MIKE WILLIAMS
16 NANCY LUBAMERSKY
PAT HALBACH
17 SCOTT SIMANSON
TOM KOWAL
18 RON L. TRULLINGER
NITA TAYLOR
19 CHARLIS MILLER

SHEILA BOTEIN
20 DEBBIE PATTERSON
JENNIFER CALDWELL
21
WASHINGTON COMMISSION
22 DAVE GRIFFITH
TOM SPINKS
23
IOWA COMMISSION
24 NYONE WILKINS
25

0004

1 APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):
2 WORLDCOM
LIZ BALVIN
3 TOM DIXON
TOM PRIDAY

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

0005

1 (List of classes attended by HPC)
2 HPC INSTRUCTOR LED CLASSES ATTENDED
3 Unbundled Loop
LNP Local Number Portability
4 Qwest 101
ASR Private Line
5 ASR Switched Access
POTS Product Overview
6 POTS Resale
UNE-P Pots
7 IMA Hands On
CEMR Classic
8 CEMR Hands On
Centrex

9 IMA Hands On
IMA Training
10 IMA Directory Listing
11 HPC WEB BASED TRAINING
12 EEL Via IMA
UNE-P ISDN
13 DS1
Frame Relay
14 Intro to Service Requests and Billing for
Co-Providers
15 LIS Trunking
LNP Self Healing Network Services
16 Synchronous Service Transport
Unbundled Network Elements (UNE-Loop, UNE Switch,
17 UDIT)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
0006

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2 MS. ANDERSON: Good morning. I would like
3 to just do a quick check on the bridge. Do we have
4 any folks on today that weren't on yesterday?
5 MS. WILKINS: Yes, this is Nyone Wilkins.
6 MS. ANDERSON: Good morning, Nyone.
7 MS. WILKINS: Good morning.
8 MS. ANDERSON: Iowa, right?
9 MS. WILKINS: That's correct.
10 MS. ANDERSON: Just a couple of
11 announcements. Although, let's see, there are
12 several faces that weren't here yesterday. We do
13 have quite a few faces that have changed. Let's go
14 quickly around the room here just so we know who is
15 on today.
16 MS. ANDERSON: Denise Anderson, MTG.
17 MR. CENTER: Bob Center, MTG.
18 MR. PETRY: Don Petry, HPC.
19 MR. MAY: Geoff May, HP.
20 MR. CROCKETT: Jeff Crockett with Snell &
21 Wilmer, outside counsel to HPC.
22 MR. FINNEGAN: John Finnegan, AT&T.
23 MR. DIXON: Tim Dixon, Worldcom.
24 MS. BALVIN: Liz Balvin, Worldcom.
25 MR. PRIDAY: Tom Priday, Worldcom.

0007
1 MR. CONNOLLY: Tim Connolly, AT&T.
2 MR. TRUDEAU: Lee Trudeau, HPC.
3 MS. STURM: JeanMarie Sturm, HPC.
4 MS. CEGELSKI: Mary Cegelski, HPC.

5 MS. GRAGERT: Liz Gragert, HPC.
6 MS. PARKER: Tricia Parker, HPC.
7 MR. SIMON: Scott Simon, HPC.
8 MR. SIMANSON: Scott Simanson, Qwest.
9 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Eric Del Rosario, KPMG.
10 MR. TRUDGIAN: Terry Trudgian, KPMG
11 Consulting.
12 MR. RUTTER: Brian Rutter, KPMG.
13 MR. HOWARD: Van Howard, KPMG.
14 MR. EMMONS: Irv Emmons, Oregon Public
15 Utility Commission staff.
16 MR. TRULLINGER: Ron Trullinger, Qwest.
17 MR. SPINKS: Tom Spinks, Washington state
18 staff.
19 MR. GRIFFITH: Dave Griffith, Washington
20 Commission.
21 MS. WHITNEY: Kate Whitney, Montana
22 Commission.
23 MS. ALLSTOT: Wendie Allstot, Colorado
24 Commission.
25 MS. NOTARIANNI: Lynn Notarianni, Qwest.
0008
1 MS. MILLER: Charlis Miller, Qwest.
2 MR. VIVEROS: Chris Viveros, Qwest.
3 MR. HALBACH: Pat Halbach, Qwest.
4 MS. TAYLOR: Nita Taylor, Qwest, New
5 Mexico.
6 MR. MEDEIROS: Anthony Medeiros, New
7 Mexico Commission.
8 MR. GORALSKI: Joe Goralski.
9 MR. STRIGHT: Bob Stright, Liberty.
10 MR. KOWAL: Tom Kowal, Qwest.
11 MS. DONALDSON: Jackie Donaldson, Qwest.
12 MR. CRAIN: Andy Crain, Qwest.
13 MS. LUBAMERSKY: Nancy Lubamersky, Qwest.
14 MS. PATTERSON: Debbie Patterson, Qwest.
15 MR. WOODSIDE: Gary Woodside, Qwest.
16 MS. CALDWELL: Jennifer Caldwell, Qwest.
17 MR. GRIFFING: Buster Griffing, North
18 Dakota Commission.
19 MR. BINEK: Bill Binek, North Dakota
20 Commission.
21 MR. FAUN: Patrick Faun, North Dakota
22 Commission.
23 MS. ANDERSON: Thanks, folks. We'll be
24 introducing the KPMG folks up here in a moment. Just
25 a couple of announcements before we start in. We'll
0009
1 be starting with section 18.7, the M&R work center.
2 We're going to be having lunch brought in as opposed
3 to going up to the cafeteria. And we're going to
4 have several folks adjourn to another room to
5 participate in the executive committee call today at
6 noon. So it won't be a working lunch per se. As I

7 said yesterday, you get to enjoy each other's
8 company.

9 The other thing that I wanted to mention
10 is when we finish covering the test section scheduled
11 for today, we would like to spend a little bit of
12 time talking about the remaining vendor technical
13 conference work to be done. We have tentatively laid
14 out another day but we have some thoughts on how that
15 might be better spaced and perhaps broken up. So we
16 would like to throw that out for discussion.

17 Any other questions before we get going?
18 All right.

19 MR. DELLATORRE: Good morning. First,
20 some introductions of the KPMG folks that are here.
21 Carrie Thielemann has been part of the jurisdiction
22 team. Anne Poranski is the process test lead for the
23 M&R domain. Russ Guzdar is the M&R domain lead.
24 John Deahl, the M&R team liaison, and Liz Fuccillo is
25 with me, Joe DellaTorre, on the jurisdiction team.

0010

1 And Mike Weeks is our lead manager. So we're going
2 to kick it off this morning with 18.7, M&R work
3 center support.

4 We do have an announcement from yesterday
5 just to tidy up some recordkeeping. HPC presented a
6 list of all of the classes that they participated in,
7 both actual classroom classes, physical participation
8 and also Web-based training. And they presented this
9 and it will be on the transcript officially so I
10 don't think we need to distribute this. But the list
11 is available.

12 MR. WEEKS: In the sort of pattern that we
13 were working in yesterday, the section we're going to
14 discuss next is 18.7 which is the M&R work center
15 support evaluation. There are a total of 19 criteria
16 in that report. Currently all of those are sitting
17 in the satisfied bucket and I think Joe will talk
18 about where we are with respect -- we'll start like
19 we did yesterday with the Washington state staff's
20 questions, go through the AT&T questions and then
21 move on to the Worldcom questions.

22 MR. DELLATORRE: So to begin, Washington
23 state staff, first question -- I'll review these just
24 briefly. The first question was a question of
25 participation or results that were either region

0011

1 specific or state specific, and this test did not
2 have any regional or state level distinctions.

3 The second question was a request to
4 discuss open or unresolved observations and
5 exceptions. And again, for this test, there were
6 none.

7 The third question was a request to
8 identify any material revisions made to the discrete

9 report sections. And as I had said yesterday, KPMG
10 Consulting intends to produce a change log. Some
11 time early next week will be our first shot at it but
12 then we will revise that over time, to indicate
13 changes that were made to the reports as different
14 versions come out. But I believe that this
15 particular test had fairly minor revisions.

16 And then finally, the fourth question from
17 the state staff was a discussion of the unable to
18 determines of which there were none.

19 We'll move on to the AT&T questions. The
20 first question, the report states, "The AMSC receives
21 trouble calls and processes trouble tickets for
22 designed type troubles." What center receives
23 trouble calls and processes trouble tickets for
24 non-designed type services? And before we go into
25 our response which is fairly detailed, I will let you

0012

1 know that we are revising section 2.1 of this report
2 to capture all of this information. So if you're
3 unable or unwilling to take the notes that I'm about
4 to go through, don't worry about it. It will be in
5 the transcript and it will also be reflected in the
6 next version of the report.

7 Trouble calls are processed by one of the
8 Qwest work centers. AMSC, RCHC or CRSAB, based on
9 one of the following: Type of services, either
10 nondesigned or designed; two, individual center hours
11 of operation; and three, existence of call overflow.
12 During normal business hours, the majority of
13 wholesale CLEC nondesigned service types are handled
14 by the AMSC.

15 However, a small part of the nondesigned
16 service troubles are handled by the RCHC. The CRSAB
17 handles large retail business and part of resale
18 nondesigned trouble tickets. During the normal
19 business day, overflow calls for both the AMSC and
20 the CRSAB are routed between each other.

21 After hours, 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.
22 Mountain, both nondesigned and designed trouble
23 tickets are handled by the RCHC in Salt Lake City,
24 Utah. The three centers are receiving and entering
25 trouble details into WFA-C and LMOS using interfaces

0013

1 such as RCE and control. Trouble testing,
2 troubleshooting, closure, et cetera, is primarily
3 performed in the DSCs and screening centers and
4 trouble repair by the field and CO technicians.
5 Trouble calls are forwarded to the DSC and screening
6 centers based on trouble type. The DSC handles
7 design tickets and screening centers handle
8 nondesigned tickets. That information will all be
9 reflected in a subsequent version of this report.

10 MR. CONNOLLY: I have a follow up, Joe. I

11 think you said something in your remarks very similar
12 to what's in section 2.1 that remains a concern. You
13 said, I believe, a small number of the nondesigned
14 trouble tickets --

15 MR. DELLATORRE: A small number of
16 nondesigned service troubles are handled by the RCHC.

17 MR. CONNOLLY: But most of them are in the
18 AMSC?

19 MR. DELLATORRE: Correct.

20 MR. CONNOLLY: What about design tickets?

21 MR. DELLATORRE: The question was on
22 nondesigned so I'm hoping that the design portion is
23 in the test.

24 MR. CONNOLLY: Okay. We'll get to that.

25 Thanks.

0014

1 MR. DELLATORRE: Okay. Question number 2.
2 The report states, "WFA-C and LMOS automatically
3 assign a committed due time and date for repair to
4 each ticket based on technician schedules and work
5 load." What role, if any, do the Qwest repair
6 guidelines play in the assignment of committed due
7 time and date? Qwest commitment times are
8 documented. M&Ps and documentation that relate to
9 commitments are listed under the comments associated
10 with evaluation criteria 18.7-1-1 and the escalation
11 documentation is in criteria 18.7-3-1.

12 Per Qwest guidelines, call center
13 personnel offer CLECs a system generated committed
14 repair time when entering the initial trouble details
15 into the system. The system bases the commitment
16 time available on feedback from the dispatch centers.
17 The dispatch centers may change the system repair
18 clock based on technician availability.

19 However, guidelines and performance
20 objectives do still apply. CLECs may contact the
21 call centers for requesting an expedited repair. In
22 such a situation, the call center attendant can enter
23 a specific command which will flag the trouble ticket
24 for prioritization and earlier dispatch. Similarly,
25 an escalated trouble ticket and/or an overdue repair

0015

1 will receive a shorter commitment time than
2 necessary.

3 MR. FINNEGAN: Can I ask a follow up?
4 When you talk about the commitment times being
5 documented, are you referring at all to -- I think at
6 one time it was called the service interval guide. I
7 don't know if it's called the same document. This is
8 the one that's available to CLECs. Is that the
9 documentation you're referring to?

10 MR. GUZDAR: Yes, it's on the Web.

11 MR. FINNEGAN: So how does the -- where is
12 the linkage between the technician availability,

13 assignment of due date and due time and the service
14 interval guide commitment time?

15 MR. DELLATORRE: That's a factual question
16 and we would have to go examine because we don't know
17 if the Web site indicates that the times being made
18 available is dependent upon technician availability.
19 We don't recall if that is in fact on the site or not
20 so we will investigate that.

21 MR. FINNEGAN: One other thing that would
22 help in the investigation is it appears on one end it
23 looks like an ASAP type of commitment that is done,
24 almost on order or trouble by trouble basis. On the
25 other end, it's out of service and it's a POTS type

0016

1 trouble, you get 24-hour commitment regardless of the
2 technician work load. It would be interesting to
3 know how the committed due time and date is actually
4 assigned. Is it done on a trouble ticket by trouble
5 ticket basis, is it done more so on a -- based on
6 standard interval guide, if you're a nondesigned POTS
7 types, you get 24-hour service regardless of
8 technician availability?

9 MR. WEEKS: Let me make sure I understand
10 the question you would like to have answered. There
11 are a set of written guidelines that are out there.
12 I think what I hear you asking is does the system
13 and/or the human beings who might override the system
14 pay attention to the guidelines and enforce the
15 guidelines as opposed to ASAP, which might be shorter
16 or longer than the guidelines, and then how does
17 technician availability influence either the system
18 or the people overriding the system and how does that
19 all mesh with the guidelines?

20 MR. FINNEGAN: Yes, and what governs. Is
21 it the ASAP type of aspect or is it the published
22 interval aspect?

23 MR. WEEKS: Right. In other words, would
24 they hold up a repair to the guideline if the
25 guidelines are being followed.

0017

1 MR. FINNEGAN: Or they might, out of rote,
2 say it's 24 hours regardless, but only use that
3 system generated ASAP type for internal purposes.

4 MR. WEEKS: I understand the question.
5 All right.

6 MR. GUZDAR: The commitment time is based
7 on the standard guidelines. The fixed time is going
8 to be different based on technician availability. So
9 the commitment time is going to be the standard
10 intervals.

11 MR. WEEKS: But I had asked the question,
12 if the system knows that the techs are all busy
13 because it's been advised of that, does it continue
14 to give the standard interval even though it's not

15 available?

16 MR. SIMANSON: What happens is the local
17 dispatch centers have the ability to go in and change
18 the clock that's available to the rep as they're
19 taking the trouble ticket. That would be under
20 abnormal circumstances, heavy rain, huge provisioning
21 load where they had to move people from repair and
22 provisioning, so forth and so forth, abnormal
23 conditions.

24 Under normal circumstances, some high
25 percentage of those clocks represent the standard

0018

1 interval. During abnormal situations where
2 technician availability isn't there where it needs to
3 be, then those clocks are moved and the
4 representative that sees that clock as they're taking
5 a ticket is automatically populated based on those
6 clocks that the dispatch center inputs.

7 MR. WEEKS: So all tickets being presented
8 are going to be given --

9 MR. SIMANSON: Based on the product, time
10 of day, so on and so forth.

11 MR. WEEKS: Based on the guidelines. So
12 if there is no abnormal situation in effect, all
13 tickets that come in, first come, first serve, are
14 going to be given the clock based on the guide?

15 MR. SIMANSON: Yes. Unless the customer
16 requests an escalation on the other side, then the
17 escalation process would do it quicker than the
18 normal interval. Again, that's a commitment. To
19 Russ' point, that's not a clear time necessarily.
20 It's a 24-hour commitment. It may be fixed in two
21 hours, may be fixed in 23 hours and 59 minutes but
22 it's a 24 hour commitment in that example.

23 MR. FINNEGAN: Does it work on the other
24 end, if it's a light day for repair?

25 MR. SIMANSON: Absolutely.

0019

1 MR. FINNEGAN: Will the technicians as a
2 matter of -- or the service center, the M&R work
3 center, as a matter of process, it turns out it's a
4 light day and the system says we think we can get
5 this done in 16 hours instead of 24 hours, will they
6 communicate that commitment to the CLEC?

7 MR. WEEKS: I guess another way to ask
8 that question, do you guys move the clock the other
9 way if it's a light day?

10 MR. SIMANSON: It's not very often that
11 that would happen. What they would do is take -- we
12 currently -- we have a very high percentage of
13 troubles cleared in less than 24 hours. Typically
14 our MTTR on the POTS side of the house is something
15 significantly less than that. But what they
16 typically do is do other type activities and we'll

17 still work within the commitment time. Now, the
18 trouble is likely to get cleared quickly but the
19 commitment was typically the same commitment.

20 MR. WEEKS: So that's consistent with what
21 we observed. What Scott has said is consistent with
22 what we observed. And if I can summarize it, I
23 think, the interval guidelines that are published set
24 the clock in the system and that's the time it's
25 quoted for all orders that come in, or all trouble

0020

1 tickets that come in. And that's what the committed
2 to time is.

3 Then repairs are done sort of fist come,
4 first serve, based on priorities and all that sort of
5 stuff. So when the trouble actually gets fixed may
6 be sooner or later than the committed to time at the
7 time the trouble ticket was entered. The only
8 exception to that is when things get really busy or
9 there is a problem of some sort and the clock has to
10 be moved, in which case the commitment times that are
11 given when the trouble ticket is entered are whatever
12 that new off guideline, whatever work load permits,
13 kind of commitment. And still the trouble may get
14 fixed faster than that, it may get fixed on that
15 interval, it may get fixed longer than that.

16 And then the third piece is CLECs can
17 request expedites and the expedite will be done off
18 guideline on an as best efforts kind of basis.

19 MR. SIMANSON: It would typically have a
20 conversation at that point with the local dispatch
21 group and say, can I take this ticket with a four
22 hour commitment on it, for example? What we don't
23 want to do is give a commitment and wind up missing
24 it.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: We did observe all three

0021

1 of those conditions in the work centers while we were
2 there.

3 MR. FINNEGAN: If I understand, the part I
4 was interested in, in terms of commitments, unless we
5 request an expedite, we will never see a commitment
6 shorter than the guidelines.

7 MR. DELLATORRE: Correct.

8 MR. FINNEGAN: We could see a commitment
9 longer than the guidelines.

10 MR. WEEKS: Correct. That's our
11 understanding.

12 MR. SIMANSON: But you would likely see it
13 cleared sooner than the guidelines.

14 MR. WEEKS: Yes, but it's the commitment
15 time he's asking about.

16 MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

17 MR. DELLATORRE: Question number 3. For
18 those of you that were here yesterday, we had a

19 running question throughout most of the sections on
20 the evaluation criteria. There is a reference to
21 evaluation criteria made in an earlier section of the
22 report. I think it's section 2.5. That reference to
23 the concept of evaluation criteria is pointing to the
24 actual evaluation criteria in the results table 3.1.
25 So when you see the word evaluation criteria upfront,

0022

1 there is no mystery. It's the same evaluation
2 criteria that you would see throughout the body of
3 the remainder of the report.

4 Question 4 was also raised yesterday.
5 Section 2, Roman numeral II is a section that you
6 have not seen that does not exist yet.

7 MR. WEEKS: It's like a discrete report.

8 MR. DELLATORRE: So this will be a stand
9 alone section to the draft final report that provides
10 some overall descriptive language and the like.

11 MR. SIMANSON: Just to follow up on
12 question 2, those clocks that I just discussed are
13 the same clocks that retail and wholesale use.
14 They're the exact same trigger.

15 MR. GUZDAR: That's one thing we were
16 going to say, too. The difference is between
17 nondesigned and designed but there is no difference
18 that we saw between retail and wholesale.

19 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 5. What
20 analysis did KPMG Consulting perform on the existence
21 and adequacy of, and adherence to, processes for
22 stopping the repair clock for no access delays? What
23 were the findings and conclusions KPMG Consulting
24 reached as a result of that analysis? And did KPMG
25 Consulting find that Qwest personnel were accurately

0023

1 and consistently following practices with respect to
2 recording of no access delays?

3 KPMG Consulting conducted observations of
4 Qwest personnel and observed those personnel
5 following the no access delay process consistently
6 and accurately while handling trouble tickets. The
7 process we observed was that a ticket is placed in no
8 access mode when a CLEC cannot be reached for
9 acceptance of the repair or when a field technician
10 cannot enter the customer property.

11 MR. FINNEGAN: Was that analysis limited
12 to the center type activity?

13 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes.

14 MR. FINNEGAN: For the technicians who
15 code the orders themselves on the nondesigned, was
16 there any observations made there?

17 MR. DELLATORRE: This actually speaks to
18 the next question which kind of moves between the
19 work center and the field personnel. And this
20 specific test is M&R work center support evaluation.

21 Our evaluation focused on the activities of personnel
22 in the work center, not the COTs and field tests. It
23 was not part of the scope of this test.

24 There are elements of the field tech
25 performance such as accuracy of repair and accuracy

0024

1 of coding and closing that are part of the testing
2 team but are not part of this test. So we watched
3 what happened from the work centers. I believe that
4 addresses question 6 as well. So we now move on to
5 the Worldcom questions.

6 The first question, was KPMG able to
7 observe Qwest's four RCHCs? The answer is yes.

8 Second question, was KPMG able to verify
9 ACD system ability to capture elapsed time of callers
10 placed on hold? The answer is no, we could not
11 verify that functionality of these technical
12 capabilities.

13 There is a quote taken from the report in
14 question 3 and a request for clarification that the
15 way the above reads indicates that as long as the
16 electronic ticket is bonded with Qwest, there never
17 is a need for manual intervention prior to WFA-C and
18 LMOS automatically assigning a committed due time and
19 date for repair to each ticket. And if the emphasis
20 was on the word never, the word never is incorrect.
21 If the service can be tested automatically, a
22 committed due time and date could be automatically
23 assigned to a bonded trouble ticket. Electronically
24 bonded tickets for troubles that cannot be identified
25 automatically are typically forwarded to the DSC or a

0025

1 screening center for further testing and scheduling.

2 Question 4. This is regarding the M&R
3 trouble ticket organizations. Was KPMG able to
4 witness these different dispatch flows to verify
5 compliance with the documented rules? The answer is
6 yes.

7 Question 5. At any time, CLECs have the
8 ability to contact the call center to receive trouble
9 ticket status information. Question: What evidence
10 was provided that led KPMG to this conclusion
11 statement? KPMG's response is we observed CLECs
12 calling into the call centers and work centers to
13 obtain trouble ticket status. We did an overview of
14 the M&R process. CLEC and Qwest responsibilities are
15 published on the Web site.

16 Question 6. Is the scrubber responsible
17 for verifying analysis codes were properly applied to
18 the trouble tickets? And the answer is yes.

19 Question 7. What is the specific process
20 employed by Qwest that identifies internal
21 escalations are required? We referenced this in our
22 criteria 18.7-3-1 and these are internal escalation

23 rules contained within Qwest documentation and like
24 the M&P requests yesterday, if there is a desire to
25 see them, we would need to invoke that process of

0026

1 getting access to that.

2 Question 8. What audit and controls are
3 in place to ensure that the Qwest escalations group
4 not only coordinates the repair but provides the
5 necessary status, progress and resolution updates?
6 There are several elements to this.

7 The process itself contains status and
8 progress update requirements for design services.
9 The DSC escalation desk actually sets physical timers
10 to track escalation intervals. Center managers are
11 responsible to verify that escalations are handled in
12 a timely and accurate fashion. And there are manager
13 reviews of escalation logs and observations of work
14 center personnel for performance evaluation purposes.
15 KPMG observed the work center personnel adhering to
16 this process.

17 MS. BALVIN: Joe, can I ask, when you say
18 they set physical timers, what is that process?

19 MR. WEEKS: We don't remember the details
20 so we'll go take that as a take-away to say what
21 system are these timers in because we don't recall.

22 MR. CONNOLLY: Mike, on Liz's question,
23 are these the same timers that are referred to in
24 18.7-3-1?

25 MR. DELLATORRE: I do recall them being in

0027

1 one of the criteria.

2 MR. CONNOLLY: It's in the sixth paragraph
3 in the comments.

4 MR. GUZDAR: Yes.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: So question 9, was KPMG
6 able to witness any joint meet coordinated tests?
7 The answer is no, that we did not observe live joint
8 meets. We did observe the work center's role with
9 regard to joint meet coordinated testing through
10 observation of coordinated testing call handling
11 activities. We also reviewed Qwest documented joint
12 meet and coordinated testing meets. We did not see
13 it happen live.

14 MS. PORANSKI: The answer to question 8
15 with regard to the timers, the timers are set and the
16 interfaces that are used are CEM controlled which are
17 the interfaces to WFA-C and LMOS.

18 MR. WEEKS: And it's in 3-1.

19 MS. BALVIN: Thank you.

20 MR. DELLATORRE: I believe that's in 18.7.
21 Any other questions on 18.7?

22 MS. WHITNEY: This is Kate Whitney from
23 the Montana Commission. On page 17 of this report in
24 the table 18.7-4-4, the first word says the AMSC call

25 answer time is 85 percent within 20 seconds and then
0028

1 the last bullet says the DSC call answering time is
2 85 percent within two minutes. Did KPMG obtain any
3 information as to the discrepancy in the standards
4 for those call answering times?

5 MR. WEEKS: So let me make sure I
6 understand the question. The first bullet on the top
7 of that page says the AMSC call answering time
8 targets are 85 percent within 20 seconds, and then
9 the fourth bullet says the DSC call answering time is
10 85 percent within 2 minutes. And you're asking
11 whether we tried to understand why there is a
12 difference in those two?

13 MS. WHITNEY: Yes.

14 MR. DELLATORRE: Actually, I think the
15 issue here is that we were identifying the various
16 metrics that they have in place to indicate that
17 there are performance monitoring procedures. We did
18 not do a validation of the actual numbers but in fact
19 pointed to those numbers to indicate that there were
20 performance measures in place.

21 MR. SIMANSON: Kate, the DSC does not take
22 customer direct calls typically. That's not a center
23 to take CLEC or customer interfacing calls. So those
24 are internal calls that there is a metric to make
25 sure you're picking up the phone internally but not
0029

1 externally, if that helps.

2 MR. DELLATORRE: And Kate, we were just
3 having that same conversation while Scott was
4 explaining that, that there are two different centers
5 that face two different directions, hence the two
6 different measures.

7 MS. WHITNEY: Thank you.

8 MR. WEEKS: But to Joe's point, we did not
9 make an attempt to try to say the Qwest internal
10 measures are good or bad.

11 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions?

12 MR. CONNOLLY: In section 2.1.2, you
13 report that the trouble tickets are assigned a ticket
14 number, the ticket number is given to the CLEC at the
15 time it reports trouble to the call center.

16 MR. WEEKS: You're at the top of page 3,
17 just for reference here.

18 MR. CONNOLLY: I'm at the fifth paragraph.
19 Given that there are multiple entry points for CLECs,
20 am I correct in assuming that there are different
21 formats or sequences of trouble ticket numbers?

22 (Caucus.)

23 MR. WEEKS: The answer is we're not sure
24 exactly how the numbers are assigned. Perhaps if
25 someone from Qwest could answer that question, we can

0030

1 take it and look into it. The system does generate
2 the number that's assigned.
3 MR. DELLATORRE: One other thing to that,
4 though, is that regardless of the method of entry,
5 EB-TA, CEMR, phone call, it all goes into the same
6 system and receives a ticket number from the same
7 system regardless of the interface that it got there
8 from. And the distinction that we're aware of is
9 designed/nondesignated, not the interface that it's
10 coming from. But for the actual assignment of the
11 number, we're unsure if there is a different scheme
12 from one interface to the next.
13 MR. SIMANSON: I don't believe there is.
14 I believe the LMOS system on the back end ultimately
15 assigns the ticket number based on order of entry.
16 MR. WEEKS: We could verify that if that's
17 important.
18 MR. CONNOLLY: Here is my confusion. You
19 say that the CLEC had the ticket number at the time
20 that it reports the trouble and if it requires LMOS
21 to admit the trouble ticket number, then there are
22 some other steps to go on between the time that the
23 trouble is reported and the time that the ticket
24 number is assigned. Would that be correct?
25 MR. GUZDAR: No.

0031

1 MR. WEEKS: I don't think that's a true
2 statement. There may be some intermediate steps
3 between the interface and the system that generates
4 the number but you get that feedback through whatever
5 technique you use to submit the order in and the
6 system that generated that number is the same system
7 in all cases regardless which of the three interfaces
8 you come through. Do we need to follow up on this?
9 Okay.
10 MR. CONNOLLY: In section 2.1.1, you refer
11 to the Pinnacle automated call distribution system.
12 Is there a difference between the Pinnacle Looking
13 Glass system and this one you refer to in 2.1.1?
14 MR. GUZDAR: Looking Glass is a software
15 on the ACD.
16 MR. CONNOLLY: And that's used by the
17 Pinnacle?
18 MR. GUZDAR: Yes, correct.
19 MR. CONNOLLY: Okay. Thanks. If you turn
20 your attention to figure 18.7-1, please. I just have
21 a couple of questions about the convention that's
22 being used here to display the connection between
23 various functions and systems. It's not clear to me
24 about the vertical line that comes downward from --
25 this is on the left-hand side -- control WFA-C. The

0032

1 vertical line that comes from that box downward.
2 Does that only go to the DSC or does it also have

3 input into WFA-DI and CORAC?
4 MR. WEEKS: I follow the connector lines.
5 We received this from Qwest so --
6 (Caucus.)
7 MR. GUZDAR: The troubles that come
8 through WFA-C are the design troubles, and they're
9 going to go directly to the DSC.
10 MR. WEEKS: So the line that goes down
11 from WFA-C to WFA-DO, what's that feed? Looking out
12 of WFA-C, it goes down to WFA-DI and WFA-DO. So
13 after it goes to the DSC, it's either DI or DO.
14 MR. SIMANSON: There are some rules within
15 WFA that will auto test and auto dispatch one
16 direction or the other based on a set criteria. So
17 the vast majority of the complex troubles will wind
18 up in the DSC. There is some small percentage based
19 on auto test rules that will go directly one place or
20 the other based on --
21 MR. WEEKS: After the MLT?
22 MR. SIMANSON: Well, in the design site,
23 it's not an MLT test. But it would go out or in
24 based on that criteria and the test results. But
25 it's a very small percentage, much higher percentage

0033

1 on the POTS side of the house than the design side
2 obviously.
3 MR. CONNOLLY: Thank you, Scott.
4 MR. SPINKS: On page 17, below the
5 bullets, there is the thing that says after initial
6 training, the employees received monthly reviews, et
7 cetera. Was KPMG able to observe any of those
8 monthly reviews?
9 MR. DELLATORRE: No. Other questions on
10 18.7? Thank you. Give us a few minutes to prepare
11 for the next section, 18.8.
12 (Pause.)
13 MR. DELLATORRE: Kate, did you have
14 something else? I'm sorry, I didn't see you.
15 MS. WHITNEY: This is very minor but
16 sometimes you spell a-i-d-e and a-i-d. And I think
17 it should be a-i-d unless Qwest has people employed
18 as job aides.
19 MR. RUTTER: Are you referencing the list
20 of documents?
21 MS. WHITNEY: Sometimes in the text.
22 MR. RUTTER: If it's a title of the
23 document, we have recapped that exactly as the
24 document name is given to us. But if it's in the
25 text, we'll find that. Thank you.

0034

1 MS. BEATON: Rebecca Beaton on the bridge.
2 I came in a few minutes late. This is Washington.
3 MS. ANDERSON: Thank you, Rebecca. What
4 we did today was just ask if there were any folks

5 that were new to the bridge today. So I will update
6 you.

7 MS. BEATON: Thanks.

8 MS. ZENGER: This is Joni Zenger from Utah
9 as well.

10 MS. ANDERSON: Hi, Joni.

11 (Pause.)

12 MR. DELLATORRE: This test is 18.8 which
13 is the end-to-end M&R process evaluation. There were
14 13 evaluation criteria, all of which are currently
15 satisfied which addresses one or two of the
16 Washington state questions. There was no distinction
17 by region or state. There are no open or unresolved
18 Os and Es. There were minor revisions made and will
19 be at least one other forthcoming that will be
20 captured on the change log. And there were no unable
21 to determines.

22 On to the AT&T questions. Number 1,
23 provide KPMG Consulting's understanding of any
24 differences in work rules established for the retail
25 RCHC versus wholesale AMSC M&R centers where those

0035

1 result from collective bargaining agreements. We did
2 not analyze or assess the collective bargaining
3 agreement impact of the processes in this test.

4 Question 2, provide the scope of the
5 targeted processes as used to limit the subject areas
6 for interviews conducted by KPMG Consulting. We took
7 this question to mean or be seeking information on
8 where the start and stop points of the processes that
9 we were looking at began and ended and, therefore,
10 whether or not there was some implied or actual
11 limitation of the interviews and activities that we
12 conducted.

13 So just for clarity sake, this test
14 evaluated the functional equivalence of Qwest's M&R
15 processing for wholesale and retail trouble reports.
16 The end-to-end process includes all activities from
17 the moment a trouble repair call is received by the
18 repair bureau or a trouble ticket is captured in
19 Qwest systems until the same trouble is closed and
20 the customer has been notified of the ticket's
21 resolution. So that implies where we sort of started
22 and stopped our assessment and those two endpoints
23 set the stage for the documents that we were
24 reviewing, the observations that we made and the
25 interviews that we conducted.

0036

1 Question 3 is that same standard response,
2 this section Roman numeral II that will be
3 forthcoming.

4 Question 4 is the discussion -- I will
5 reference the discussion we had moments ago in the
6 18.7 section, how due dates are assigned by SIG

7 escalation and impacted by tech availability.
8 Question 5, I will also refer back to 18.7
9 for the process of stopping repair clock and no
10 access delays with one emphasis made here, given that
11 this is a parity evaluation, that the process is the
12 same and was observed by KPMG as being the same for
13 both wholesale and retail customers.

14 Question 6. We observed -- I guess I'll
15 go through the question. It does not appear from the
16 report that KPMG Consulting interviewed or observed
17 in action central office technicians or field
18 technicians. And goes on to elaborate about that to
19 some degree. We observed center personnel
20 dispatching work by product, not by customer type,
21 wholesale or retail.

22 This is a process parity evaluation and
23 our ability to assess whether or not parity was met
24 was not required for us to actually roll with the
25 field techs. We did observe the center personnel

0037

1 dispatching work by product and the processes
2 designed by field technicians do not discriminate
3 between wholesale and retail customers but rather
4 they are assigned work by product type.

5 MR. FINNEGAN: Can I ask a clarifying
6 question?

7 MR. DELLATORRE: Certainly.

8 MR. FINNEGAN: We had this discussion on
9 the last section, the 18.7. Do you consider the
10 central office technicians and the field technicians
11 within the scope of this end-to-end analysis?

12 MR. DELLATORRE: In terms that they are
13 part of the overall M&R process?

14 MR. FINNEGAN: Well, in terms of
15 particularly for the nondesigned type services, it's
16 the field technicians, and I'm not sure if it's the
17 central office technicians as well, that are
18 responsible for closing out the trouble ticket.

19 MR. DELLATORRE: That's correct. Either
20 central -- either the work center personnel or the
21 field techs can close out the tickets.

22 MR. WEEKS: Or they call the center and
23 have the center close the tickets.

24 MR. DELLATORRE: So they are involved in
25 the process. As a parity evaluation -- well, please

0038

1 continue.

2 MR. FINNEGAN: So from a high level
3 perspective, do you see the field technicians and the
4 central office technicians within the scope of this
5 analysis?

6 MR. WEEKS: The process they used is
7 within the scope of this.

8 MR. FINNEGAN: So is this the case -- and

9 I think we may have seen this in a prior discrete
10 report where the documentation and the M&Ps were
11 reviewed as to what the central office technicians
12 and field technicians should be doing, but there was
13 no actual observations of the central office
14 technicians and the field technicians following those
15 M&Ps and processes?

16 MR. WEEKS: Except to the extent that they
17 needed to interact with center personnel or CLEC
18 personnel as part of the execution of their process
19 and we did observe field techs interacting with
20 center technicians for those portions of the process
21 that overlap both the field tech and the central
22 office. So there was some -- we saw calls take place
23 between field techs, central office techs and people
24 in the centers and we saw CLECs interact with people
25 in the field as well. So I wouldn't say we didn't

0039

1 see any of the process but if you're asking us if we
2 did ride alongs on M&R in the field or if we did
3 visits and watched repair activities in the CO, the
4 answer is no.

5 MR. FINNEGAN: Did you obtain any sense of
6 what split there might be for nondesigned troubles as
7 to troubles that the field tech or the CO tech
8 handled on their own without support from the center
9 versus ones where there may be interactions with the
10 center?

11 MR. WEEKS: We don't know the answer to
12 that. I'm not even sure we can speculate well.

13 MR. FINNEGAN: Thanks.

14 MR. DELLATORRE: First Worldcom question.
15 What are the hours of operation for the RCHCs that
16 support Qwest retail customers? And we wanted to
17 make a note that the RCHC supports wholesale
18 customers as well as retail customers. The RCHCs
19 have the following hours of operation. Des Moines,
20 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. Central, Monday through
21 Friday. Phoenix, 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Mountain
22 time, Monday through Friday. St. Paul, 7:30 a.m. to
23 9:00 p.m. Central time, Monday through Friday and
24 Salt Lake City, 24 by 7.

25 Question 2, what analysis did KPMG perform

0040

1 to determine parity exists between the DSC and the
2 screening center? We did none. The parity
3 evaluation is between wholesale and retail, not
4 between one center and another. These centers handle
5 different product types and we did not evaluate
6 parity between them.

7 And the third question, how did KPMG
8 attempt to preserve blindness during their
9 observations of the end-to-end trouble processing
10 activities? As a white box test, there was no

11 attempt to preserve blindness. We went in and
12 interviewed personnel and reviewed documentation and
13 made observations.

14 MR. WEEKS: And observed the process in
15 operation.

16 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions on test
17 18.8?

18 MS. ALLSTOT: On 18.8, page 12, up towards
19 the top, in that second paragraph, it says the WFA-C
20 and LMOS tickets may not be closed prior to customer
21 acceptance unless a customer does not respond to
22 repeated Qwest contact attempts. Are there
23 guidelines on at what point a ticket can be closed
24 out as far as how many repeated attempts have to be
25 made?

0041

1 MR. WEEKS: The answer is yes. The answer
2 is there are formal guidelines. Those are in Qwest
3 documents and we need to invoke that process to
4 review those.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions on 18.8?

6 MR. CONNOLLY: The scrubber function
7 that's in the DSCs, and maybe the AMSCs also, I'm not
8 sure where they are situated, but do they perform
9 their function on wholesale and retail trouble
10 tickets?

11 MR. WEEKS: It's designed versus
12 nondesigned, so to the extent to which they're both
13 wholesale and retail going through designed and
14 nondesigned, then the answer would be yes.

15 MR. CONNOLLY: So the scrubber is only on
16 designed services?

17 MR. WEEKS: Yes, designed.

18 MS. WHITNEY: On my copy of this, and mine
19 doesn't track with Wendie's so I don't know if the
20 page numbering is correct --

21 MR. WEEKS: We send different ones to
22 everyone.

23 MS. WHITNEY: On page 18.8-11, in that
24 table that's 18.8-1-5, January 16th, 2002, this is
25 call answering time again. That bullet that says

0042

1 performance data includes MR2, 80 percent of calls
2 answered within 20 seconds. If you look at the
3 previous report, 18.7, that table we were looking at
4 before, it talked about a performance standard of 85
5 percent within 20 seconds on call answer time. I'm
6 just wondering, is it 85 percent or 80 percent? Or
7 are there two different standards?

8 MR. WEEKS: I think we're describing a PID
9 here, MR2. And the PID was 80 percent within 20
10 seconds, where the other was internal.

11 MS. WHITNEY: I thought the PID was
12 parity.

13 MR. WEEKS: I don't know. Let's look the
14 PID up. If that's correct, which it appears to be --
15 there are a lot of people that know more about the
16 PID than I do are shaking their head yes, so we'll
17 change it.

18 MS. WHITNEY: The same thing in the MR9
19 where it's up in the standard, too.

20 MR. WEEKS: We will look at these bullet
21 points and make sure we have quoted the right
22 standard here. Thank you.

23 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions? We'll
24 move on to 24.9 in a few moments.

25 (Pause.)

0043

1 MR. DELLATORRE: This is test 24.9,
2 network surveillance and outage support evaluation.
3 There were 12 evaluation criteria of which all 12
4 were satisfied. We'll jump right into the questions.
5 There were no regional or state observations made,
6 there are no open and unresolved observations and
7 exceptions. There were some revisions made to the
8 report which will be noted in our change log and
9 there were no unable to determines.

10 AT&T's question, provide the evaluation
11 checklist and the evaluation criteria. That is our
12 standard answer on the clarification around what
13 we're referencing when we refer to the evaluation
14 criteria.

15 Worldcom question. First question. How
16 did KPMG verify the same systems used to monitor
17 Qwest retail facilities are used to monitor
18 facilities leased by CLECs? We verified the
19 information through interviews and observations with
20 Qwest personnel using NMA and other network
21 monitoring applications.

22 The second question. "Together, Qwest's
23 two NROCs located in Colorado and Minnesota provide
24 comprehensive surveillance and outage notification
25 support services throughout the Qwest network." The

0044

1 question is, what evidence was provided to KPMG that
2 led to the previous conclusion statement? And we
3 were surprised. We weren't attempting to make a
4 conclusion but rather just make a statement of fact
5 and we recognized that the word comprehensive was
6 unnecessary and possibly misleading. Those two
7 centers provide all of the surveillance and outage
8 notification support so we will edit that word
9 comprehensive out of the report.

10 MR. WEEKS: And just to follow up on the
11 answer to question 1, in section 2.1.1 that describes
12 the network surveillance systems, there is a
13 paragraph or so there that describes NMA and what its
14 functions are.

15 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 3, and this is
16 regarding the sharing of duties between NROCs. What
17 are the procedures employed to invoke a switch in
18 responsibility? And again, you can get this from the
19 transcription. Each network reliability operations
20 center has the capability to take over for the other
21 at a moment's notice. This notice may be in the form
22 of a phone call from one center to the other or via
23 E-mail. This is done in practice as part of the
24 Plymouth center closing down to the Littleton center
25 6:00 p.m. each evening. As the Plymouth center

0045

1 closes, a call is usually placed to notify the
2 Littleton center of any significant events currently
3 in progress. The Plymouth center comes back on line
4 at 7:00 a.m. the following business day. That same
5 process of roll-over from one day to the next also
6 takes place over the weekend.

7 Question 4. How did KPMG verify that
8 abnormal event notifications were received by the
9 identified external parties? Abnormal network
10 condition reports, ANCRs, which are the reports of
11 service affecting conditions detected in the network,
12 are sent via E-mail to both the P-CLEC and KPMG
13 Consulting's electronic mailbox. We noted on these
14 E-mails that the distribution list included the other
15 CLECs as well. So we were able to note just from the
16 E-mail header itself that the distribution list
17 included the CLECs, the P-CLEC and KPMG Consulting
18 itself.

19 Question 5, in relation to circuit
20 performance. Was KPMG able to witness any such
21 occurrence of suboptimal performance? The answer is
22 no. If so, was there any proof that Qwest DSC is
23 committed to providing assistance to both wholesale
24 and retail customers on a parity basis? So there
25 were no suboptimal conditions that occurred during

0046

1 our observations and interviews.

2 However, we discussed in test criteria
3 24.9-3 of the discrete report that Qwest personnel
4 did demonstrate actions that would be undertaken
5 during a network event or outage. We observed NROC
6 personnel demonstrating the actions that would be
7 taken in order to perform an event diagnosis as well
8 as to originate an ANCR. Finally, the NROC is blind
9 to the type of traffic that is currently being used
10 over or traveling over the network, whether it is
11 retail or wholesale.

12 Question 6. Does Qwest employ any audit
13 and controls in an effort to reduce the level of
14 chronic troubles? The answer is yes. KPMG states on
15 page 24.9.6, which may or may not be your page, in
16 the bulleted, quote, chronic section of the test

17 report, that DSCs monitor all circuits DO and above
18 for which troubles have been reported three times
19 during the previous 30 days. The DSCs are made aware
20 of such troubles by receiving reports such as the 3
21 and 30 or calls from Qwest account managers or
22 customer calls. The responsible DSC notifies the
23 affected customer, either wholesale or retail, of the
24 chronic trouble and will continue monitoring the
25 circuit through trouble resolution and closure.

0047

1 Question 7. Was KPMG able to witness
2 redundancy capabilities as well as the ability of all
3 DSCs to assume responsibilities? The answer is no,
4 we did not witness redundancy capabilities. We did
5 learn through observation and interviews that each
6 DSC has the capability to access the network testing
7 and monitoring equipment of the other centers. This
8 action is accomplished by entering the systems such
9 as NMA used by other DSCs, but we did not actually
10 observe the assumption of responsibilities from one
11 to the next.

12 Questions on section 24.9? Mr. Finnegan.

13 MR. FINNEGAN: It's not so much a question
14 as an editorial request. In section 24.9, and it
15 might have been in other parts of the report as well,
16 in the comments section, there would be reference
17 made to an observation or exception but the
18 observation or exception would not be specifically
19 identified.

20 The request is, when KPMG refers to an
21 observation or exception, could you please
22 specifically identify it? And if you're looking for
23 an example, on page 24.9-23, in the table 24.9-10,
24 there is a statement, during testing, KPMG Consulting
25 found that Qwest failed to consistently provide

0048

1 notification of abnormal network events or outages to
2 its customers that have requested notification. KPMG
3 Consulting formally identified this issue of the
4 inconsistent notifications.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: I can respond that our
6 process or our approach is that we will identify
7 exceptions by number in the report. Observations are
8 identified through the issue, as is the case here.
9 We make note of the issue that we found but we do not
10 identify the observation by number. The distinction
11 being that an observation is just that, it's a
12 finding that we made. It doesn't necessarily have a
13 material impact on the conclusion that we draw,
14 unlike an exception which likely results in a not
15 satisfied and, therefore, if there is a satisfied in
16 the result, the implication is that that exception
17 was -- there was some resolution and then
18 verification of those test results by KPMG.

19 So we will identify exceptions by number
20 so that folks can understand that there was a change
21 over time and then also going and getting the
22 supporting information, the exception. The
23 observation, we saw something, we noted it in the
24 report but it was less material than the exception.

25 MR. FINNEGAN: And I understand that
0049

1 distinction. I just think for research, when you're
2 reading through the report, it makes it easier just
3 to know what one you're talking about, not to try to
4 change your standard at all. It's just from an
5 editorial perspective.

6 When I first went through this, I didn't
7 know if you had identified it at all. You made note
8 of it and the question is, where is the observation
9 or exception. And it was unclear at the time whether
10 it was a failure to note it or it was just
11 unidentified, and it appears it was unidentified and
12 I think in future reports, it will help the reader to
13 be able to understand how you came to that satisfied
14 result if you specifically identified it.

15 MR. DELLATORRE: Another reason why this
16 isn't baked into individual evaluation criteria is
17 that observations are not necessarily related to a
18 specific or individual evaluation criteria. And
19 therefore, the linkage is not as clear as it tends to
20 be with exceptions.

21 However, I completely appreciate and
22 understand your question and request. What may be a
23 possibility for us to consider is somewhere in the
24 front or at the back of one of these reports, we
25 could identify the observations by number sort of in

0050
1 a list rather than trying to bake them into each of
2 the test cross-references which would be a bit more
3 challenging for us to do because they're not always
4 linked so cleanly. So we may be able to put a
5 paragraph upfront, observations 1, 2 and 4 were
6 related to this test.

7 MR. FINNEGAN: That would be helpful. But
8 if there are cases where you're writing something and
9 you're thinking of a specific observation, could you
10 identify that in the comment as well rather than --

11 MR. WEEKS: We understand the request.
12 We'll talk about it.

13 MR. DELLATORRE: We'll consider that.
14 Other questions on 24.9?

15 MS. ALLSTOT: Evaluation criteria 24.9-6.

16 MR. DELLATORRE: Okay.

17 MS. ALLSTOT: First test cross-reference
18 says 24.9-5 and I think if you go back to the dash 4
19 and the second one references dash 6 and I think it
20 should be the dash 5.

21 MR. WEEKS: The words at the bottom, the
22 last sentence? These activities were performed as
23 defined in the documentation listed in test
24 cross-reference 24.9-6 above, and obviously it's
25 self-referencing which is not appropriate. And

0051

1 you're suggesting it should be 9-4, not 9-5.

2 MS. ALLSTOT: No, that one should be 9-5
3 and I think the one in the middle of that section is
4 9-4.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: We will clarify that and
6 make sure that's right.

7 MR. WEEKS: Thank you.

8 MR. DELLATORRE: Other comments,
9 questions? Ms. Anderson, back to you.

10 MS. ANDERSON: Well, all I do is say,
11 "We're ready to move on," and "Take it away, Joe."
12 We're changing teams. So Joe just suggested we go
13 ahead and take our morning break so we might as well
14 do that and then they'll change teams and we'll start
15 in 15 minutes.

16 (Recess.)

17 MS. ANDERSON: Just another minor
18 announcement about food. Lunch is going to be
19 brought in a little early because we seem to be
20 progressing quite rapidly. This is a sure sign we
21 will hit a wall.

22 MR. WEEKS: Shouldn't have said that.

23 MS. ANDERSON: But you'll be well fed as
24 you crash into the wall. So with that, thanks to
25 Lynn Notarianni arranging to have lunch brought in

0052

1 just a little early. That case, in case we do
2 finish, folks can have their bite to eat. With that,
3 I'll turn it over to Joe.

4 MR. DELLATORRE: We're going to begin test
5 19.6 which is the daily usage feed returns,
6 production and distribution process evaluation. We
7 will do an introduction. Carrie is still with us.
8 Terry Trudgian is the billing domain lead. Eric Del
9 Rosario was the test lead for one of these tests.
10 I'm sorry, I don't recall. Van Howard is the DUF
11 test lead of this facility. And Joe Goralski was the
12 test 20 test lead in the billing domain.

13 We'll begin with 19.6. For both 19.6 and
14 20.7, it will be more explanatory language upfront as
15 there are conditions that differ from the other tests
16 that we have encountered so far. So I'll turn it
17 over to Mike for some of that discussion.

18 MR. WEEKS: 19.6, for the scorecard, 19
19 evaluation criteria. We currently have 15 sitting in
20 the sat state, 2 in the not satisfied state and 2 in
21 the unable to determine state so we can kind of get
22 behind those four that are outliers here. Oops,

23 that's probably a loaded term I don't want to use.
24 Sorry about that. But anyway, the four that aren't
25 in the satisfied state, by answering a combination of

0053

1 Washington state staff question and one of AT&T's
2 questions as well.

3 The answer to the Washington state first
4 question, which is are there any sort of regional
5 Washington state specifics in this test which is a
6 test of the daily usage feeds, return, production and
7 distribution process, is no, there aren't any
8 specifics there. But when we talk about open or
9 unresolved Os and Es, there are several there.
10 30-36, 30-37 and 31-13 are currently open for tests
11 and are driving the current not satisfiees that are
12 sitting out there in evaluation criteria 19.6-1-5 and
13 dash 1-6. So the two not satisfiees again are tied
14 to those three exceptions.

15 The third Washington state question which
16 has to do with material revisions, not at this time
17 but I think you can anticipate that there will be as
18 we clean up these other areas. With respect to the
19 question of this unable to determine, it's kind of
20 tied up -- the answer to that is tied up in the
21 answer to AT&T question number 4, so we'll kind of
22 kill two birds with one stone here and talk about
23 that.

24 There is a DUF return process that is -- a
25 usage return process that's sitting out there that

0054

1 does not have any commercial usage as of the date of
2 that report and, therefore, we haven't been able to
3 do commercial observations. Now, the P-CLEC did do
4 some testing of the technical ability of a CLEC to
5 make returns to Qwest but we've not seen any
6 commercial parties actually going through this
7 process and so we felt that we would be more
8 comfortable giving an unable here than relying solely
9 on what amounts to fundamentally an acceptance test
10 type of process that was done through this pseudo
11 CLEC. So that's why those things are still unable.

12 MR. DELLATORRE: And just a point of
13 clarification, we reviewed the process and,
14 therefore, the fact that the process exists and was
15 defined, we were able to do that. But the lack of
16 commercial activity impacts the unable to determines
17 with regard to adherence to that process.

18 MR. WEEKS: So that's kind of where we sit
19 in terms of the not satisfiees and the unables. Any
20 questions on those two particular topics? And then
21 we'll go through the individual questions.

22 MR. DELLATORRE: One other point that I
23 would like to make before we go to questions. I just
24 wanted to make clear that the exceptions referenced

25 here were actually derived from the test 19

0055

1 transaction activities because there is a
2 relationship between the transaction activities and
3 the underlying process that supports it, particularly
4 in this case where there were systems embedded
5 elements to the process that we then used to suggest
6 the effectiveness of that process by analyzing the
7 outputs of that process. And in doing that exercise,
8 we found that the end result or the product of the
9 process was deficient in some areas raising relevant
10 exceptions and then, therefore, had impact on the
11 process conclusions that we were drawing.

12 MS. TRIBBY: Can I ask a process question?
13 This appears to be the only discrete test report that
14 you all have put out for a test that's not yet
15 concluded.

16 MR. WEEKS: I think there have been
17 others. That may be the state at this point but I
18 know there have been -- Brian is shaking his head.

19 MR. RUTTER: 20.7.

20 MR. WEEKS: 20.7 is another example.

21 MS. TRIBBY: I guess I'm trying to
22 understand why we're doing that on some of the tests
23 and, B, how we should read this report vis-a-vis
24 other discrete test reports where the test has not
25 yet concluded and there are not satisfiers. Is it an

0056

1 interim discrete report? Can you just kind of go
2 through a little bit --

3 MR. DELLATORRE: Absolutely. I think it's
4 the word concluded. I would argue that we don't
5 consider any of the discrete reports concluded.
6 These are reports that present the facts as we find
7 them at the time of the issuance of that report and
8 there are cases like 19.6, 20.7, I believe 12.8, 24.8
9 where there are more direct correlations between
10 transaction activities and process evaluations that,
11 while -- the notion isn't that the transaction tests
12 are clearly not concluded and, therefore, results
13 from those transaction tests may have impact on the
14 associated process tests.

15 That same logic is applied to every
16 discrete report that we have discussed in the
17 previous day and a half. So I'm not quite taking
18 issue with the notice of concluded but, rather,
19 drawing the distinction between something that's
20 actually done versus something that is subject to
21 change if another element of the test, if an
22 observation or an exception, if a discussion in a
23 forum like this -- there are a number of ways that
24 any of the discrete reports that we've issued so far
25 may have to be revised for one reason or another.

0057

1 MR. WEEKS: And sort of as another -- I
2 think what we're trying to say is the areas -- this
3 is a process test. The areas -- we've reviewed the
4 process, we've gone through the process, we
5 understand the process. There is not much work for
6 us to do on the process. The not satisfieds come in
7 those areas where we're unable through white box
8 testing to go any further. And we, therefore, relied
9 upon another test to give us evidence as to whether
10 these processes that are embedded in software are
11 working or not.

12 And so we're really holding this one open,
13 so to speak, pending what we see in this other
14 transaction oriented test. But we won't be doing any
15 more process testing per se. There is nothing else
16 to do from a white box perspective. So it's sort of
17 technically open, if you will, pending what happens
18 in these transaction tests. So once we see what
19 happens in the transactions test, we'll just either
20 close these exceptions because the problem went away
21 and then they'll go to satisfieds and we're done,
22 which is just a mechanical updating of this report,
23 or it will continue to be a problem and this report
24 will continue to have not satisfied in it until the
25 problems are fixed. So there is just nothing else to

0058

1 do here except watch what goes on in another test.

2 MS. TRIBBY: And Joe, I appreciate what
3 you said, because I would agree nothing is concluded
4 until you issue your final report. When issuing a
5 report where not all the criteria are either
6 satisfied or unable to determine, it's not so much
7 there is a process evaluation to occur but you're
8 waiting on the results of other tests.

9 MR. WEEKS: Exactly.

10 MS. TRIBBY: Thank you.

11 MR. FINNEGAN: A clarifying question on
12 the two unable to determines. And I may be
13 advertising my ignorance of the billing process but
14 it appears to be focused on DUF returns. Is this
15 something that the pseudo CLEC could do if there is
16 some error on their bill to return it and say, we
17 believe there is a mistake, can you correct it?

18 MR. DELLATORRE: The pseudo CLEC -- we
19 have knowledge that the pseudo CLEC does support that
20 capability but there is no commercial activity and I
21 would draw an analogy to something like dark fiber
22 where we have the capability of sort of stimulating
23 events around that but there is no commercial
24 activity to support the findings, to act as control
25 groups, to be the actual primary focus of our

0059

1 evaluation. So we have elected to take this path not
2 unlike with dark fiber where, if we can't see it

3 happening out there with real live action, then we're
4 much more hesitant about drawing conclusions.
5 The P-CLEC does have this capability to
6 support this process. Another confounding factor is
7 our payment structure that we have negotiated through
8 contractual terms that is different from a real
9 commercial player and, therefore, it wouldn't be
10 indicative of the actual commercial process that we
11 would prefer to review.

12 MR. FINNEGAN: Help me understand. Is
13 this something where the CLEC gets a DUF file, looks
14 at it and says, we think there is some sort of error
15 in here, we're returning it, here is why we think
16 it's in error, Qwest, we would appreciate you to
17 correct it or credit us or whatever has to be done.
18 Is that the essence of the returns process?

19 MR. WEEKS: Yes.

20 MR. FINNEGAN: And with that
21 understanding --

22 MR. WEEKS: The answer is we could. We
23 chose not to.

24 MR. FINNEGAN: Well, a different question.
25 To say there is no commercial activity, is that

0060

1 because Qwest doesn't make mistakes on DUF?

2 MR. HOWARD: The DUF returns process
3 mechanically involves, once the DUF is received by
4 the CLEC -- the method of communication between the
5 CLEC and the ILEC with the DUF returns process is
6 through a codings structure only, that is defined by
7 EMI guidelines. There is a number of these codes,
8 they have a fairly succinct definition. This is a
9 rather aged way of handling these things.

10 To your point, John, typically, in our
11 experience, when a CLEC has a problem with a DUF
12 file, they don't deal with it this way. And we've
13 not seen this process in use in our other tests.
14 What they do is they pick up the phone and call
15 somebody and say, I've got a problem with my DUF
16 file, rather than shooting codes back and forth at
17 each other and shooting files back and forth at each
18 other, they simply pick up the phone, call their
19 account manager or whatever defined structure is
20 within the ILEC organization and deal with the
21 problem that way.

22 MR. WEEKS: There is a mechanical
23 workaround that appears to be superior to the
24 technological returning of DUF.

25 MR. HOWARD: In other words, if I got a

0061

1 DUF record back and I said, this is not my DUF
2 record, rather than setting this code, having the
3 two-day NDM going through this stuff and sending the
4 file back to Qwest, I would pick up the phone, call

5 the account manager and say, you're sending me
6 records that don't belong with me and we need to deal
7 with it.

8 MR. FINNEGAN: That much I understand. It
9 just appears to raise a question, are we testing the
10 right process or have you tested that mechanical
11 returns process or observed how it's being used? If
12 the pick up the phone and call Qwest to say there is
13 a problem with DUF is the de facto process and nobody
14 uses the mechanical or the electronic process, I can
15 understand why you may not be able to make a
16 determination on the electronic process. Did your
17 analysis also include any findings or perspective on
18 the usability of the ad hoc process?

19 MR. HOWARD: We did actually go out and
20 review the help desk procedures for dealing with both
21 generic and usage specific problems as part of this
22 test. We also did go actually watch the center deal
23 with receiving phone calls. We did not actually
24 observe a DUF problem when we were actually out at
25 the field doing the help desk observation. We have,

0062

1 however, gotten information from a friendly CLEC on a
2 dialogue about DUF problems and retransmission
3 requests, things of that nature.

4 MR. FINNEGAN: And is that in this section
5 of the report, the 19.6?

6 MR. HOWARD: It is not in the returns
7 specific criteria. It is not criteria in this
8 report.

9 MR. WEEKS: It's in the help desk
10 evaluation criteria as opposed to the DUF return
11 evaluation criteria because it's just one of the
12 processes the help desk supports.

13 MR. FINNEGAN: Have we done the help desk
14 yet on billing?

15 MR. WEEKS: I think it's in this section
16 of the report. Ah, it was billing. So 24.10? The
17 answer is that in the 1-2 evaluation criteria is
18 where the help desk was evaluated in terms of how
19 well it addresses customer needs which included, as
20 has been suggested, things that have to do with usage
21 billing and usage processing and so on.

22 MR. DELLATORRE: As well as 1-3 which
23 discusses the contacts, the availability of Qwest
24 personnel for CLECs to initiate this process.

25 MR. FINNEGAN: This might be an editorial

0063

1 request but it would be helpful to make that linkage
2 to the unable to determines to this help desk.

3 MR. WEEKS: Okay.

4 MR. FINNEGAN: It just seems like there is
5 no commercial observation and that's disconcerting,
6 but with the explanation, it sounds like a reasonable

7 explanation and I think that linkage would help --
8 MR. WEEKS: Sure. Tie the two together?
9 MR. FINNEGAN: Yes.
10 MR. MAY: I just wanted to state for the
11 record that the process of establishing that return
12 capability was covered in the interim report of the
13 pseudo CLEC, section 8.2.2 and 8.2.3.
14 MR. WEEKS: Thanks.
15 MR. DELLATORRE: Thanks, Geoff. Other
16 questions in the Washington state section or the
17 subject matter in it?
18 MR. SPINKS: Just to confirm, there is no
19 open observation here?
20 MR. DELLATORRE: Observations? I don't
21 believe so.
22 MR. WEEKS: No Os, just Es.
23 MR. MAY: Just for the record, we wanted
24 to state too, there were two Os and Es opened on
25 establishing the capability and those observations

0064

1 and exceptions have been closed, resolved.
2 MR. WEEKS: And that's reflected in the
3 report?
4 MR. MAY: In the interim report. They
5 were disclosed at the time of the interim report.
6 MR. WEEKS: So HPC is basically sharing
7 with us that if you want to see what activities they
8 did and what issues they found when they attempted to
9 make the electronic process work, you can go to their
10 report. What's the date on that report, Geoff?
11 MR. MAY: March 31st, 2001.
12 MR. WEEKS: So go ahead with AT&T's
13 questions.
14 MR. DELLATORRE: And we'll note that this
15 discussion that we've had now will in part or in
16 total address many of the questions that we're about
17 to discuss.
18 The first question, in fact, is a request
19 for information regarding KPMG Consulting's effort to
20 solicit CLEC participation with the usage returns
21 process. And in fact, we did make attempts both on
22 our own and publicly during TAG calls and we received
23 one CLEC who was willing to volunteer but in fact
24 later learned that that CLEC did not use the returns
25 process. So we did solicit participation.

0065

1 Question 2. How did KPMG Consulting
2 discharge its obligation in section 19.6.6.2, step 2,
3 to prepare CLEC assistance solicitation materials?
4 Please identify. And that kind of goes back to
5 question number 1 where we made written, verbal and
6 public calls -- requests for CLECs to participate.
7 In addition, and a little bit of speculation here but
8 at least in some cases we requested MTG's assistance

9 in garnering CLEC participation.

10 Question 3. How did -- select CLEC
11 participants and arrange for observations? We
12 basically selected everyone who was willing to come
13 on board. If you apply, you're accepted.

14 MR. FINNEGAN: Can I ask a clarifying
15 question? There appears to be a distinction made
16 between the electronic returns process and the manual
17 returns process. The MTP doesn't appear to make that
18 distinction. It just talks generically about the
19 returns process. Is your reason you took the limited
20 definition of the returns process as only the
21 electronic returns process?

22 MR. WEEKS: It says it's an operational
23 analysis which is by definition a white box test as
24 opposed to transactions based test. So that's why we
25 didn't pursue aggressively the pseudo CLEC part of it
0066

1 but as to -- if you're asking specifically why, once
2 we discovered that no one was using the electronic
3 process, we didn't shift over our analysis to look at
4 the sort of manual or ad hoc process that's used.

5 MR. FINNEGAN: Well, I thought you did
6 look at the manual ad hoc process.

7 MR. WEEKS: Well, we've seen evidence that
8 it exists. I don't know that -- I'm going to ask the
9 question. Van, is there a formal, written --

10 MR. HOWARD: We're kind of heading down a
11 path here. There is really not a manual returns
12 process. There are ways of dealing with DUF issues
13 outside of the --

14 MR. WEEKS: So there is no formal process.

15 MR. HOWARD: The definition of the returns
16 process by its very definition is an electronic
17 passing of the file back to Qwest. There is no
18 manual equivalent per se.

19 MR. DELLATORRE: There is one formal
20 process that we attempted to evaluate but were unable
21 to do so. Hence, the unable to determine. We
22 learned that there is an ad hoc process that is not a
23 formal process, therefore, not subject to evaluation
24 that we kind of backed into some information through
25 our evaluation of the help desk process and the
0067

1 availability of the Qwest personnel to CLECs. But
2 that was an indirect evaluation.

3 MR. FINNEGAN: The concern is, from a
4 process perspective or at least a test process
5 perspective, you did a process evaluation of a
6 process that nobody uses and the process that
7 everyone uses you couldn't evaluate because Qwest has
8 no defined process. And the fact that there is no
9 defined process for this process that everyone uses
10 seems to be a problem.

11 MS. FUCCILLO: Can you explain what you
12 mean by seems to be a problem?

13 MR. FINNEGAN: Well, let's say everyone
14 picks up the phone and calls the help desk and says,
15 I've got a problem with my DUF and that's what
16 everyone uses, but you couldn't do a process
17 evaluation of that because there are no M&Ps that
18 Qwest has that defines how they --

19 MR. WEEKS: I disagree with that. There
20 is an M&P that says you will use electronic returns.
21 People just choose not to use it. That is not a
22 decision made by Qwest. That is a decision made by
23 CLECs.

24 MR. FINNEGAN: I understand that. But the
25 reality is nobody uses that process and the ad hoc

0068

1 process is not the exceptional process. It's the
2 rule.

3 MR. WEEKS: I understand your point, and
4 I'm just saying the formal stated Qwest process,
5 which is what we're here to evaluate, is that you
6 would do electronic returns. The fact the CLEC
7 chooses not to use that process for whatever reason
8 is a CLEC decision and not a Qwest decision. If we
9 press Qwest for what is your formal process, they're
10 going to tell us it's the electronic return process.
11 So we're in a Catch-22. We can't win this one as
12 testers.

13 MR. FINNEGAN: Well, one possible solution
14 would be to say, Qwest, you should probably document
15 this process, everyone's process.

16 MR. WEEKS: That would have involved
17 subjective opinion as opposed to objective -- you
18 have a missing process. I understand what you're
19 saying, you understand what we're saying. It is what
20 it is. If you want to ask the TAG to have us put
21 forth an observation or an exception on this, then
22 we'll consider that.

23 MR. FINNEGAN: And I'm not suggesting an
24 observation or exception as much as it's an
25 evaluation of the returns process and if the returns

0069

1 process that everyone uses --

2 MR. DELLATORRE: Doesn't exist.

3 MR. WEEKS: If they invented their
4 process, because I'm sure every CLEC does it slightly
5 differently, there is no Qwest M&P that defines roles
6 and responsibilities for this manual return process.
7 So if you're suggesting that the absence of that
8 formal M&P on Qwest's part to acknowledge what's
9 going on in the real world is a problem and an issue
10 and you feel strongly about it, then I would raise
11 that issue with the TAG. I think as testers, we're
12 sort of obligated to test what the company publishes

13 as being their official party line. And that's what
14 we've done.

15 MS. ANDERSON: Just a question. Would
16 this be something that was covered in the account
17 management relationship thing?

18 MR. WEEKS: No.

19 MR. DELLATORRE: We wouldn't have
20 evaluated the existence, the adherence, the
21 well-formedness of this ad hoc returns process in the
22 account management evaluation.

23 MR. WEEKS: Account management is all
24 about relationship management. It's not about the
25 specifics of doing business.

0070

1 MS. ANDERSON: But what I'm hearing is
2 that -- at least if I understood him correctly --
3 that the CLECs call the account manager and say, my
4 DUF file is bad.

5 MR. WEEKS: That's one of the techniques.
6 The other is to call the help desk.

7 MS. ANDERSON: Oh, I see. Okay.

8 MR. CRAIN: But you've evaluated calling
9 the account manager, you've evaluated calling the
10 help desk. There seem to be three processes that
11 you've looked at that they're separately -- you could
12 look at them separately, not necessarily in this
13 particular context but the fact that somebody uses a
14 separate process that you've looked at for dealing
15 with this particular issue doesn't mean that we need
16 to have some kind of set process separate from the
17 general account -- the help desk account management.

18 MR. DELLATORRE: And I think the context
19 was developed in a sense that we cannot make any
20 claims or draw any conclusions about the help desk or
21 the account management's ability to deal specifically
22 with DUF returns because that's not what we were
23 looking for when we were evaluating those two areas.
24 So the context is significant in our ability to draw
25 conclusions about adherence to a process that appears

0071

1 to be only loosely defined.

2 MR. FINNEGAN: So if I understand the net
3 of all of this is, in terms of the returns process,
4 it will remain an unable to determine.

5 MR. WEEKS: The evaluation of the
6 electronic will be an unable because it's not used.
7 You're raising a second issue which is if there is a
8 missing formal process for manual occurrence as
9 opposed to -- or whatever you want to call it, and
10 you feel that there should be one and there is not
11 one, then that is something that we could take up.
12 But from a content of the report perspective, we
13 haven't done it, it's not there.

14 MR. FINNEGAN: And a different

15 perspective, maybe subtle, you certainly evaluated
16 the help desk but you didn't evaluate it specifically
17 to draw a conclusion on the ad hoc undocumented
18 manual returns process.

19 MR. WEEKS: We're not aware of a written
20 process or a set of guidelines or job aids or
21 anything that tells either the account team or the
22 help desk what the roles and responsibilities are for
23 returning DUF in any written formal way. Am I wrong
24 there?

25 MS. FUCCILLO: In this context, you

0072

1 wouldn't be returning anything. You would be calling
2 up and stating a problem and seeking assistance.

3 MR. DELLATORRE: So there are M&Ps and
4 guidelines and job aids around escalation of issues
5 and that is what we looked at. So it's kind of a
6 fine line.

7 MR. WEEKS: Well, let me ask Van a more
8 pointed question. Do we have any evidence that any
9 CLEC ever returns DUF per se?

10 MR. HOWARD: No.

11 MR. WEEKS: So what happens is they call
12 and say there is a problem with DUF.

13 MR. HOWARD: That's correct.

14 MR. WEEKS: And the DUF gets recreated and
15 reproduced?

16 MR. HOWARD: Qwest deals with it, yes.

17 MR. WEEKS: Or it is dealt with. So there
18 are no returns of DUF period in the real world.

19 MR. DELLATORRE: Even in this help desk
20 process that we're talking about. It's not a formal
21 return.

22 MR. WEEKS: People don't return DUF. They
23 report problems with DUF files and the problems get
24 corrected.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: And we do talk about the

0073

1 escalation process and the fact that they are
2 available and all those sorts of things.

3 MR. MAY: We actually were the first CLEC
4 ever to establish the capability for using it. I
5 don't know if we're the only one at this point but we
6 were the first.

7 MR. WEEKS: So maybe this is coming full
8 circle, maybe this is a tempest in a teapot because
9 there is no commercial evidence that anybody ever
10 returns DUF so there doesn't need to be a process to
11 define how to do something nobody desires or wants to
12 do.

13 MS. TRIBBY: Does not return them
14 electronic or does not return them --

15 MR. WEEKS: Technically, they don't return
16 DUF, period. They ask for fixes or retransmissions,

17 not returns.

18 MS, TRIBBY: If you didn't evaluate the
19 manual return process --

20 MR. WEEKS: There is no manual return
21 process. There are no manual returns.

22 MR. DELLATORRE: There is a correction
23 process or a request for correction, but there is no
24 return.

25 MS. TRIBBY: How do you know that if you

0074

1 didn't look at it?

2 MR. WEEKS: We know that from talking to
3 real CLECs in the real world and by talking to people
4 in the centers and by talking to the people that
5 handled this for a living.

6 MR. HOWARD: The returns process is
7 defined as returning your DUF file to the records,
8 rejecting it, repacking it and sending it back the
9 way you got it, either NDM or tape or whatever.

10 MR. FINNEGAN: I'm not trying to be a time
11 machine but with what we know, what we know now,
12 would this returns evaluation be better described as
13 a request for retransmission?

14 MS. FUCCILLO: No. Requests for
15 retransmission are processed through the help desk.
16 There is no electronic request that you make. So you
17 cannot say that one is synonymous with the other.

18 MR. FINNEGAN: Well, it seems like you
19 might get a DUF and say, hey, looks like we got the
20 XYZ CLEC information on our DUF, looks like a
21 mistake, could you fix it. What are we expecting
22 back from Qwest when we make that request?

23 MR. WEEKS: Well, let's back up. Would I
24 get a corrected DUF file or would I be told to ignore
25 the records that don't belong to me in the future?

0075

1 If I forget them --

2 MR. HOWARD: I don't know.

3 MR. WEEKS: We're not sure what would
4 happen in that case where you got somebody else's.

5 MR. CONNOLLY: Somebody else's
6 intermingling with ours and the only ones sent back
7 are the ones that don't belong to us?

8 MR. WEEKS: Right. My guess is Qwest
9 would tell you to ignore the ones that don't belong
10 to you and process the ones that do. I'm sure if you
11 requested a tape that had only your records on it,
12 you probably could get that.

13 MR. CRAIN: The bottom line is this ends
14 up being a problem between Qwest and the CLEC that's
15 dealt with like any other problem. The fact that
16 this particularly affects DUF doesn't mean it's
17 really that much different from any other issue that
18 a help desk or an account manager deals with. And

19 yes, there is a separate process to handle some
20 things that if CLECs choose to use it, fine and
21 great. But the fact that it's usually dealt with as
22 just a problem rather than as a particular process to
23 follow is really the situation you're dealing with.

24 MR. WEEKS: So in answer to your question,
25 John, knowing what we know now, what would our

0076

1 evaluation criteria look like, we would probably have
2 an evaluation criteria that says something like there
3 is an escalation process to deal with problems
4 encountered in the DUF file.

5 MR. FINNEGAN: And is there some sort of
6 evaluation -- and I don't want to characterize it
7 because I'll probably get it wrong -- is there some
8 type of evaluation both from a process and a results
9 perspective, we call up and say there is a problem
10 with the DUF file.

11 MR. WEEKS: So do we have an evaluation
12 criteria already in the report that addresses
13 escalating problems with DUF, reporting them to the
14 account team, reporting them to the help desk and so
15 on?

16 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes, we do.

17 MR. WEEKS: And that is 1.2 and 1.3.

18 MR. FINNEGAN: You think that has been
19 evaluated?

20 MR. DELLATORRE: What's been evaluated is
21 the structure of the help desk and the contact points
22 at that help desk. Are they sufficient to cover the
23 anticipated requests and needs of the CLEC.

24 MR. WEEKS: And it does include DUF.

25 MS. TRIBBY: But you haven't evaluated how

0077

1 those requests for escalation are dealt with or what
2 the results of those requests for escalation are that
3 are placed through the help desk?

4 MR. DELLATORRE: No.

5 MS. FUCCILLO: We've evaluated how they're
6 dealt with but not the results. So we visited the
7 center, we made observations of calls coming in, how
8 the reps were handling those calls, the M&Ps that
9 they referenced and what steps to follow in the event
10 they get a request for this or a request for that.
11 It was not solely focused on DUF returns, if you
12 will, or we've got a wrong DUF, but more broadly of
13 any call that came in, what was the nature of the
14 call, was there an M&P that a rep would follow to
15 resolve that request.

16 MR. WEEKS: But in terms of following up
17 on individual calls to see if it's ultimately a
18 problem that got resolved, we didn't do that.

19 MS. TRIBBY: Or how it got resolved.

20 MR. WEEKS: Or what it took

21 organizationally to fix the problem that was reported
22 to the help desk.

23 MR. FINNEGAN: But something specific like
24 when you call up and you identify a problem with DUF,
25 we've looked at that and the process is really great

0078

1 or whatever you call it, it was really great or it
2 was really terrible, you haven't made that
3 conclusion. You're just looking at it from a generic
4 billing help desk perspective?

5 MR. WEEKS: I think that's true. Have we
6 done any work to see what the M&Ps that are used by
7 the billing related people that deal with problems
8 that are reported through the help desk?

9 MS. FUCCILLO: When you say billing --

10 MR. WEEKS: Somebody at Qwest owns DUF.
11 It's not the help desk.

12 MS. FUCCILLO: It's the wholesale help
13 desk.

14 MR. WEEKS: Well, they get the questions
15 but they don't own the DUF file.

16 MS. FUCCILLO: And if you look in 1-2,
17 criteria 1-2, there is reference to the corporate
18 information systems organization that supports
19 resolving issues.

20 MR. WEEKS: So the help desk would report
21 the work to Qwest as reported to the help desk, will
22 in turn open some sort of trouble ticket and pass
23 that on to the IS folks. But we didn't look at the
24 M&Ps that IS uses to diagnose and fix whatever
25 problem has been reported to the help desk or DUF.

0079

1 Did we do that?

2 MS. FUCCILLO: No.

3 MR. WEEKS: No, we did not.

4 MS. TRIBBY: Maybe one last question.
5 Maybe this is outside the scope of your test. I
6 suspect it might be. But did you do an analysis or
7 provide any information about why no one is using
8 this process, whether it's too difficult to use, it
9 doesn't work well, it's expensive? Since you weren't
10 able to observe it, were you able to do any analysis
11 about that?

12 MR. WEEKS: We didn't do any formal
13 analysis. What we would say based upon our
14 experience of having talked with CLECs and having
15 talked to people, it's a bit heavy handed to go
16 through the computer programming and do everything
17 you need to do to have this electronic returns
18 process. It's much more effective and efficient to
19 pick up the phone and call and say, I have a problem.
20 So that would be our speculation but we don't have
21 any detailed analysis that's in any report or in any
22 of our work papers where we've done a survey and have

23 all sorts of results.

24 MS. TRIBBY: Would HP have done that in
25 terms of setting up that electronic manual return

0080

1 process? Would you have done an analysis of the ease
2 of using it, whether there were problems with it, why
3 maybe other CLECs are choosing not to use that?

4 MR. MAY: At the time we developed this
5 capability, there were portions of the service that
6 were not in a final state at Qwest, but we did open
7 observations and exceptions on the building of this
8 capability, as stated before, and the reference for
9 those would be in the interim report. And then as a
10 part of our own final activities report, it would
11 cover the portion of the process that we were unable
12 to do originally at the time we -- the part that was
13 covered in the interim report.

14 MR. DELLATORRE: In terms of billing it.

15 MR. MAY: That's right.

16 MR. WEEKS: But the other part of Mary's
17 question, did you do any work talking with other
18 CLECs or anything to evaluate why nobody else --

19 MR. MAY: No, we did not.

20 MS. TRIBBY: As a follow up to that, then,
21 is Qwest putting forth a process for this electronic
22 return that isn't fully capable yet? Is that why
23 CLECs aren't using it?

24 MR. MAY: It is a process that's been
25 documented for a couple of years. We were the first

0081

1 CLEC to ever ask to use it and essentially we -- like
2 we've stated, we did find some problems and we had
3 some issues. We issued observations and exceptions.
4 Beyond that -- I'm sorry, can you repeat the
5 question?

6 MS. TRIBBY: What I'm getting at is, it
7 may have been documented for two years but when you
8 actually tried to implement it, you found that
9 portions of it were not ready essentially.

10 MR. MAY: Correct.

11 MS. TRIBBY: And you took a process and
12 made that the focus of your evaluation that
13 apparently it's not ready for prime time.

14 MR. WEEKS: No, I think the statement
15 would be is now ready for prime time.

16 MR. MAY: Right. Because the observations
17 were closed, resolved.

18 MR. WEEKS: So the process, as has been
19 said, is documented, is well formed, it has been
20 tested to set it up, not to operate it over some
21 period of time. So I think there is enough evidence
22 that if a CLEC wanted to use it, they could use it.
23 It's just people aren't choosing to use it. And if
24 you want to figure out why people aren't choosing to

25 use it, I guess you need to talk to your colleagues
0082

1 in the CLEC community because we're not sure and HP
2 is not sure. We have some speculation but we don't
3 have any facts.

4 MS. TRIBBY: And Geoff, your Os and Es
5 deal with all of the portions of the system that
6 weren't ready as well as the other problems that you
7 encountered at the time you tried to set it up?

8 MR. MAY: Correct. And then the
9 documentation that's used surrounding the process.

10 MS. TRIBBY: And were the fixes that
11 caused you to close the Os and Es fixes that allowed
12 the pseudo CLEC to get this up and operating or were
13 you satisfied that they were fixes that were
14 systematic that would have been available to every
15 CLEC that might have tried to do this?

16 MR. MAY: They were both systematic and
17 documentation was issued which was published to the
18 whole CLEC community.

19 MS. TRIBBY: And that was sufficiently
20 completed and those Os and Es closed prior to you all
21 starting your evaluation of the system?

22 MS. ANDERSON: Okay, are we ready to move
23 on already?

24 MR. WEEKS: Beat that little garter snake
25 to death.

0083

1 MR. DELLATORRE: Question number 5. This
2 is a question about a comment of the breadth of
3 topical coverage is adequate to address wholesale
4 customer needs. What standards did KPMG Consulting
5 use to determine the adequacy of topical coverage?
6 And KPMG combined its experience with working within
7 ILECs, working in testing of ILECs in the billing
8 arena, in other jurisdictions for other ILECs. In
9 addition, we, as the P-CLEC, in some jurisdictions
10 and in association with the P-CLEC in this
11 jurisdiction, we were able to assemble our own set of
12 customer needs, if you will.

13 In addition, there are some examples in
14 test cross-reference 19.6-1-1 of the types of
15 requests and questions that were received by the help
16 desk that KPMG was able to use in establishing the
17 coverage needs.

18 Did KPMG Consulting's determination of
19 customer needs factor in interviews with CLECs? The
20 answer is no. Did KPMG Consulting query any CLECs to
21 determine the CLEC perspective on the adequacy of the
22 topical coverage and whether the corporate
23 information systems and wholesale help desks address
24 wholesale customer needs? The answer is no.

25 Question 6. Based upon Qwest's 2/11/02

0084

1 response, is exception 3037 going to be retested?
2 The answer is yes. And this relates to test criteria
3 19.6-1-6.

4 Question 7. Did KPMG Consulting review
5 any requests from either the P-CLEC or a CLEC to
6 obtain prior period DUFs for retransmission? If the
7 answer is yes, please describe how KPMG Consulting
8 reviewed and analyzed the requests and the Qwest
9 responses. The answer to this question is yes.
10 E-mail traffic was obtained from a friendly CLEC and
11 a review indicated that the retransmission request
12 was handled in one day as we note in test criteria
13 19.6-1-14.

14 MR. WEEKS: Which doesn't mean to imply
15 there are unfriendly CLECs.

16 MR. DELLATORRE: Question 8. Did KPMG
17 Consulting seek any P-CLEC or CLEC assistance in
18 evaluating whether the DUF is corrected and returned
19 according to a defined schedule? If so, what was the
20 result? And the answer is yes.

21 MR. HOWARD: We did seek assistance. We
22 sought specific assistance with the returns process
23 as mentioned before and got no volunteers. So we did
24 seek assistance. The result was we did not get any.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: And very similar answer

0085

1 to question number 8, did KPMG Consulting seek any
2 P-CLEC or CLEC assistance in evaluating whether CLECs
3 can readily obtain status on DUF return requests? No
4 volunteers, no DUF return requests, no status
5 updates.

6 Question 10. Please identify the test
7 cross-references impacted by exception 3047. And the
8 answer is none. Usage billing exceptions do not have
9 a bearing on test 19.6. And I was just informed and
10 reading as we go that questions 11, 12, 13 and 14 all
11 have the same answer, that the exceptions that are
12 cited, 3049, 3050, 3051 and 3080 are not related to
13 test 19.6.

14 Question 14, please identify the test
15 cross-reference impacted by exception 3113 which
16 related to EMI records. How does the fact that this
17 exception remains open reflect the result described
18 in table 19.6-2. And this exception affects the
19 current not satisfied result for test criteria
20 19.6-1-5 and is being retested in test 19.

21 MS. THIELEMANN: Joe, we seem to have a
22 question number issue here. That is noted as
23 question number 15 on the version that was last
24 distributed.

25 MR. DELLATORRE: Does everyone know the

0086

1 question that I was just referencing? Exception 3113
2 was the question. All the other exceptions do not

3 relate to test 19.6. Exception 3113, which is coming
4 from test 19, does impact this test. And it is
5 currently up for retest or in retest and is resulting
6 in a not satisfied in this test.

7 Moving on to the Worldcom questions.

8 MR. FINNEGAN: Can I ask a follow-up
9 question? This is related to that 19.6-1-5 test
10 cross-reference. Specifically on exception 3036,
11 looking at the response from Qwest and from KPMG, it
12 appears KPMG expects some DUF or a DUF record and
13 Qwest has counterclaimed that no AMA records were
14 generated. Can you please describe in English what
15 that means? Is that you made a call and Qwest
16 doesn't think you made a call?

17 MR. HOWARD: What they're claiming is the
18 switch did not cut a record. The AMA record is the
19 record cut by the switch itself. Their claim is that
20 the switch didn't cut a record.

21 MR. FINNEGAN: And you believe on the KPMG
22 side that there was a call made, you made a record of
23 it --

24 MR. HOWARD: That is correct.

25 MR. FINNEGAN: On a call log?

0087

1 MR. HOWARD: That is correct.

2 MR. FINNEGAN: And the AMA record
3 generated -- could be it was lost or routed to the
4 wrong CLEC?

5 MR. HOWARD: Have no idea.

6 MR. DELLATORRE: That's why we're
7 retesting it. Question number 1 with Worldcom.
8 We'll try our best to confuse folks with the ordering
9 of the questions. So the first question, was KPMG
10 able to witness the processes around DUF production
11 and distribution. And we did not actually watch the
12 printing or the sort of the courier trucks moving
13 these things around. What we did do was look at the
14 outputs of that production and distribution to look
15 at the DUF records themselves.

16 MR. WEEKS: And we did walk through the
17 center and conduct observations.

18 MS. FUCCILLO: Yes, we visited the centers
19 but DUF production is a system generated -- not
20 something we can peek into. So we looked at the
21 output of that process and evaluated the adequacy of
22 the output.

23 MR. WEEKS: We also inspected the people
24 that sort of operated that process and watched the
25 computer system screens and things that they use to

0088

1 manage, monitor and control that process.

2 MS. FUCCILLO: And interviewed them and
3 they walked us through the process.

4 MR. WEEKS: But the actual physical

5 manufacturing of that is done by computers.

6 MR. DELLATORRE: And just for tracking
7 alone, I don't believe that question was on the
8 sheets that most of you all have. That's why I
9 started with that. Now we will go to, I believe
10 there are four questions that you see and we will go
11 through those hopefully in order at this point.

12 The first question is on the returns
13 process. And again, as I said earlier, we did review
14 the documentation and we did do interviews with Qwest
15 personnel around the returns process so we were able
16 to confirm that that returns process does exist and
17 is defined and documented as advertised. But as we
18 discussed, we didn't see it happen in real life.

19 The next question, were the methods
20 employed by KPMG to validate accuracy, completeness
21 and timeliness of processes used by Qwest to produce
22 and distribute the DUF, and to process DUF returns
23 successful? The answer is yes.

24 Next question, did KPMG attempt to
25 preserve blindness during the interviews with Qwest

0089

1 subject matter experts? The answer is no. It was
2 white box testing and we went in and interviewed
3 personnel.

4 The next question, what is KPMG's plan to
5 address not satisfied and unable to determine
6 results? Which we discussed earlier.

7 Other questions on 19.6?

8 MR. KOWAL: Going back to the questions
9 11, 12 and 13, could you give us a status of the
10 exceptions 3049, 3050 and 3051?

11 MR. HOWARD: 3049 is closed, 3050 has been
12 reopened and 3051 is closed.

13 MR. KOWAL: And 3046?

14 MR. HOWARD: 3046 is closed.

15 MR. FINNEGAN: I have a question on test
16 cross-reference 19.6-1-15, on my page 19.6-12 of the
17 Valentine's Day version, this is talking about
18 capacity management. And the question is in relation
19 to another earlier test cross-reference 19.6-1-12.
20 And dash 12 is talking about policies regarding
21 historical DUFs and in there it's noted that the
22 usage data is retained for a period of 180 days. Did
23 KPMG have any finding or conclusion on the adequacy
24 of 180-day retention in the context of capacity
25 management?

0090

1 MR. DELLATORRE: No, we did not.

2 MR. WEEKS: We didn't link the two
3 criteria, if that's your question.

4 MR. FINNEGAN: Thanks.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions for 19.6?
6 Kate.

7 MS. WHITNEY: Mike, you made a couple of
8 references to a white box test and yesterday you
9 talked about a black box test. For a layperson like
10 myself, can you give a quick and dirty explanation?

11 MR. WEEKS: Absolutely. I apologize for
12 using jargon. We consider a black box test to be a
13 test where the tester is sitting outside of whatever
14 system or process is being observed and testing it
15 with no knowledge of what's inside the box, just a
16 definition of what the interface specification is
17 supposed to look like.

18 So the test 12 transaction testing that's
19 being done by the pseudo CLEC is a perfect example of
20 black box testing. You get the specifications, you
21 build your interface to the spec, you test it, you
22 send transactions in and you try to determine whether
23 the system, if it's given proper inputs, gives you
24 the proper outputs. And what you're trying to do is
25 understand the synchronization between the

0091

1 documentation that you receive as an outsider and the
2 behavior of the system which you know no details of
3 the internals of. And that's the analogy of a black
4 box. You can't see inside of it.

5 MR. DELLATORRE: An actual CLEC is
6 typically going to be in that position.

7 MR. WEEKS: So we're in effect trying to
8 look at the thing from outside in as an outsider
9 would.

10 A white box test is where you sort of go
11 inside the box. You can see inside the box, you know
12 what's going on internally inside the box and what
13 you're trying to do is walk through and see if, from
14 an insider's view, the thing is behaving the way that
15 it was specified that it should.

16 So almost all of our process tests are
17 white box tests in the sense that we're inside the
18 walls at Qwest in a way no CLEC would ever be allowed
19 to be and we're trying to validate that M&Ps exist,
20 that they're well formed, that they're followed and
21 that they're adhered to and so on because some of
22 these management kinds of processes that are in
23 place, like capacity management, for example, you
24 can't see them from the outside and the only way you
25 can see them is to go inside.

0092

1 So the numerous questions that we've
2 gotten over the years, not just here, about
3 blindness, you try to work very hard to preserve
4 blindness in black box tests because you want to get
5 a true read on the behavior of the system without the
6 knowledge of the people that are inside the system
7 that they're being tested.

8 On white box tests, it's almost impossible

9 to do blind testing because the very nature of the
10 activities that you're doing, the people know you're
11 there and they know they're being interviewed, they
12 know someone they don't know who doesn't work for the
13 company is asking them all these questions about how
14 they do all this sort of stuff so that's the
15 distinction between the two techniques.

16 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions? All
17 right. Give us a few moments and we will proceed.

18 (Pause.)

19 MS. ANDERSON: We're going to pick up with
20 20.7.

21 MR. DELLATORRE: I'm going to turn it over
22 to Mike Weeks. We have some conditions here we need
23 to explain.

24 MR. WEEKS: You should be aware the basis
25 for the questions we're going to be answering was the

0093

1 report dated October 31st. You should have gotten a
2 revised report for 20.7 dated March 1st that came out
3 last week. So we may be referring you to that as we
4 go along here but we'll try to answer the questions
5 that were asked based on the previous version.

6 So where we are on this test, if you use
7 the October 31st one, 21 evaluation criteria, 14 of
8 which were sats, 4 not sat, 1 not complete and 2
9 unables. The March 1st report reflects 17 satisfies
10 instead of 14 so there are three that moved out of
11 not satisfied to satisfied. We'll talk about those
12 in a minute. But the other not complete and unables
13 remain.

14 So again, to summarize that, in the
15 transition between the two reports, we moved three
16 from not satisfied to satisfied. So if we wanted to
17 sort of jump in then to the Washington state staff
18 questions, there was again no regional kind or state
19 specific results to report here. Discussing open and
20 unresolved Os and Es, we fundamentally have -- if I
21 can tie sort of observations and exceptions to
22 particular evaluation criteria because I think that
23 may kind of help folks think through this, the three
24 that are going from not satisfied to satisfied or
25 that did go from not satisfied to satisfied were 1-7,

0094

1 2-4 and 3-3 and the remaining not satisfied is 1-4.

2 Now, there are three Es and one O that are
3 sort of related to the October version of this
4 report. 3050 relates to 1-7. 3080 relates to 1-4,
5 1-7, 2-4 and 3-3. And 3081 relates to 1-4, 1-7, 2-4
6 and 3-3. There is an observation out there that I
7 remember, 3076, that is related to the not complete
8 which is evaluation criteria 2-2.

9 So that's kind of the crosswalk or the map
10 that gets you back and forth between the evaluation

11 criteria that were not satisfied or not complete in
12 the October 31st report and how those three
13 evaluation criteria migrated to satisfied and how the
14 exceptions that were out there were related to that.
15 Are there any questions about sort of that mapping?
16 I know it was like (gesturing), but if you want to
17 get with me after the thing if you have a need to --
18 want to follow up on that, I would be happy to go
19 back through that mapping with you again.

20 Any material revisions, the answer is yes,
21 we've made material revisions between specifically
22 these two releases. And the two unable to determines
23 that are sitting out there at this point are kind of
24 related to -- obviously it's 20.7. 1-5 and 1-9. And
25 we're not able to do those -- these are related to

0095

1 sort of the archiving of information and have we
2 validated that the process is being followed.

3 Archiving calls for, I believe it's six
4 years. Has there been six years' worth of data to
5 archive yet, which is the 1-9 part. And so we talked
6 about sort of different ways to try to figure out if
7 the process is being followed and we can kind of
8 examined, gee, they appear to be doing things now but
9 we can't really go back and say there is six years'
10 worth of data out there because we weren't doing this
11 process six years ago. So we're sort of in a
12 Catch-22 where we can't really fix this problem
13 because it's related to time, not to our efforts or
14 Qwest's efforts.

15 And then on 1-5, Joe alluded to this
16 earlier, we're not using the normal payments and
17 adjustments process for the pseudo CLEC and so on for
18 reasons that had to do mostly with blindness and just
19 the financial reality of trying to pay these bills
20 and so on. We, with the help of MTG and others,
21 negotiated a different payment mechanism so that
22 Qwest systems would be whole and we wouldn't have to
23 have a whole bunch of money forked out and so forth
24 to do this. So we're unable to observe this process
25 through the P-CLEC because we don't do the normal

0096

1 CLEC process here.

2 MR. DELLATORRE: In this case, as with the
3 other unables, we were able to do sort of the upfront
4 existence definition documentation but the adherence
5 was skewed and that's what led us to the unable to
6 determines for these.

7 MR. WEEKS: So let's jump in, if there
8 aren't any questions on that, to the AT&T questions.

9 MR. DELLATORRE: Question number 1, I
10 believe, is our standard evaluation criteria question
11 so we will move directly to question number 2, which,
12 just for clarity sake, we believe that this

13 particular criteria result has changed three times,
14 in fact. It began as an unable to determine, it
15 moved to a not satisfied and has recently been
16 changed to a satisfied. So that's the life cycle on
17 this particular criteria and that's directly in
18 response to question number 2.

19 For question number 3, the
20 cross-references impacted by exception 3081. I went
21 through them in number 4 but very briefly, 20.7, of
22 course, 1-4, 1-7, 2-4 and 3-3.

23 The next question, to what extent did KPMG
24 witness the bill production and distribution process?
25 Not unlike the DUF distribution or production

0097

1 distribution process, we did walk throughs, we
2 conducted observations, we examined artifacts of the
3 process and we reviewed current outputs of that
4 process.

5 Question 2. Was KPMG able to meet all
6 test targets and measures? The answer is yes, with
7 the exception of the two unables, and we're still
8 pending on the not complete, the single not complete
9 and the single not satisfied.

10 Question 3. Did KPMG attempt to preserve
11 blindness during interviews with Qwest subject matter
12 experts? And we have discussed the blindness concept
13 in white versus black box testing.

14 Question 4. Specifically, what
15 methodology was used by KPMG to validate accuracy of
16 rates and charges applied, completeness of inputs to
17 bills and timeliness of bill deliveries? To take
18 those three somewhat differently or separately,
19 rather, validating the accuracy of the rates and
20 charges applied is really an area that's covered more
21 directly in test 20. And in fact, some of that work
22 is ongoing. We've conducted reviews for rate table
23 updates and processing and the like observation.
24 3076 is the reference point.

25 But for the other two areas in this

0098

1 question, completeness of inputs to bills and
2 timeliness of bill deliveries, or rather the process
3 of the timeliness of bill deliveries rather than the
4 timely delivery of bills, for those two, I would
5 refer folks to a series of criteria. For
6 completeness of inputs to bills, the criteria that
7 captures that are 1-6 and 1-7. And the elements and
8 subprocesses covered in those two criteria address
9 the notion of the completeness of inputs to the
10 bills. In terms of processes to ensure the
11 timeliness of bill delivery, we refer folks to the
12 following four criteria. 1-11, 1-12, 3-1 and 3-2.

13 And also for question 5, I think we've
14 gone through the plans to address not satisfied or

15 unable to determines. We are either currently
16 addressing them or have already explained for the
17 unables why we cannot.

18 Other questions on section 20.7?

19 MR. FINNEGAN: A follow-up question. And
20 I may be fixing up my recollection. I've been trying
21 to read exceptions lately and I may be crossing the
22 border between 20 and 20.7, but I recall one of the
23 exceptions that's probably more so related to 20 was
24 that Qwest was incorrectly applying discounts or
25 billing the wrong rates for wholesale items and that

0099

1 a fix was applied and KPMG saw bills with accurate
2 discounts and rates applied and there was closure of
3 the exceptions.

4 My question is, from a process
5 perspective, would you have looked at whether Qwest
6 fixed that just for the pseudo CLEC or was there some
7 systematic method where they could go back and fix it
8 for everybody if there was some process problem that
9 was causing incorrect application of discounts?

10 MR. DELLATORRE: Two different
11 possibilities. And we'll get to the specifics, but
12 two different possibilities, of course dependent upon
13 response. If there is an incorrect rate contained
14 within a particular table, that could be viewed as a
15 software fix that would be changed and would be
16 consistent and after that applied appropriately. So
17 that would be distinguished from a process response
18 or fix that was implemented such as a review of the
19 process of updating and maintaining rate tables,
20 which we've associated with the observation 3076.

21 So there are conditions, given the
22 responses, different reactions on our part and
23 requirements to assess whether there was a piece of
24 software that was changed and the presumption then
25 is, is that going to behave in a consistent manner

0100

1 from that point forward, versus the process that
2 surrounds how those updates have been made. And
3 we've dealt with and observed both of those
4 conditions.

5 I think you may be referring to exception
6 3048 here and that particular situation you all may
7 want to elaborate.

8 MS. FUCCILLO: I'll give just a general
9 overview and then we can talk about the specific
10 exceptions. In the course of executing test 20, we
11 encountered many different situations that led us to
12 believe that there was a process failure in how Qwest
13 maintains their tables and updates their tables, both
14 on the rates and the discounting tables.

15 Therefore, not only were we interested in
16 that they fix those table rates and discount rates

17 but we went back and said, this seems to be systemic
18 of -- leads us to believe you've got a process
19 breakdown. So we did both, John. We went back, we
20 reexamined their process and after they implemented
21 some fixes both on the usage rate tables as well as
22 the recurring and nonrecurring tables, the usage
23 process updates. Then Howard actually did those
24 observations, personally walked through the new
25 process that was put in place and found it to be

0101

1 adequate. We also then examined the output of those
2 processes and determined that, in fact, it was
3 adequate.

4 On the recurring and nonrecurring side,
5 however, we are not ready to say that we found their
6 process improvements adequate and that's still under
7 review.

8 MR. WEEKS: And to John's subpoint, do we
9 have any reason to believe that the pseudo CLEC got
10 any preferential or differential treatment in either
11 the process or the software?

12 MR. HOWARD: No.

13 MR. FINNEGAN: So generally, when we read
14 these responses, it sounds like you are looking both
15 from a pseudo CLEC perspective and how it cuts across
16 CLECs in general to rule out the special treatment on
17 a particular fix.

18 MR. DELLATORRE: Yes.

19 MS. FUCCILLO: Yes, we are.

20 MR. WEEKS: Yes, I think in general, if I
21 can overgeneralize, which is always dangerous, in a
22 black box test, we can't tell whether it's been done
23 for everything. All we can say is that we sent the
24 proper messages in and behaved the right way and got
25 the right responses back. On the white box test,

0102

1 since we're inside walking through, we use more than
2 a reasonable amount of effort to try to make sure
3 that we understand the process applies to everyone.

4 MR. FINNEGAN: In this case, it seems like
5 it's a combination of both black box and white box.

6 MR. WEEKS: It is, which is why I said
7 what I said.

8 MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

9 MR. DELLATORRE: Other questions on 20.7?
10 Thank you for everyone's participation and I hope
11 this was useful to all parties.

12 MR. WEEKS: We're going to have our other
13 discussion after lunch or now?

14 MS. ANDERSON: I was thinking we might be
15 able to just rush through a couple of things now and
16 then we could finish that on a TAG call. Just in
17 terms of a few closing items, first of all, we have a
18 take-back to figure out and address with Qwest if

19 there could be some access to M&Ps for folks that
20 have signed confidentiality agreements. That came up
21 yesterday and we'll need to work with Qwest on that.

22 MR. FINNEGAN: Can I put in an associated
23 one that KPMG has that list at the room so they know
24 who can see and who can't?

25 MR. WEEKS: Yes, that's fine.

0103

1 MS. ANDERSON: And actually, we have the
2 list and remember, we talked on the last TAG about
3 just posting that list on the Web site. And they of
4 course would have a copy. So I'm going to update
5 that list and get rid of some folks that are no
6 longer participating and we'll make that available.

7 MS. THIELEMANN: And Denise, that's part
8 of an overall effort or activity that we need to do
9 which is to review the whole work paper access and
10 confidential document access.

11 MR. WEEKS: Right. There is two parts to
12 it. There is access to the work papers that happen
13 to contain confidential information, some of which is
14 from the company M&Ps. Then there is the separate
15 question of things that we don't have that people
16 would like to review that are in the custody of the
17 company that we need to have a policy or a process
18 for accessing those as well.

19 MS. ANDERSON: Other than M&Ps.

20 MR. WEEKS: Or whatever it is. But it
21 would be primarily M&Ps.

22 MS. ANDERSON: We have several KPMG
23 follow-up questions which your folks have jotted
24 down.

25 MR. WEEKS: We've taken notes. In fact,

0104

1 we had two people scribing and we have the
2 transcript.

3 MS. ANDERSON: So those will be coming in
4 the next week or two as you get a chance to answer
5 those?

6 MR. WEEKS: Right. And probably my guess
7 is the answers would be most easily handled on a TAG
8 call or something like that. That's just off the top
9 of my head.

10 MS. ANDERSON: We can work out the
11 mechanism.

12 MR. DELLATORRE: Very different
13 follow-ups. Answers to questions can be provided
14 quite easily. Often or frequently we need to make
15 revisions to reports and those will come out as they
16 come out.

17 MR. WEEKS: My thought on the TAG as
18 opposed to in writing is it would allow for follow-up
19 questions and clarifying questions and so on.

20 MS. ANDERSON: We can devote some time to

21 that. It won't be Thursday's TAG and we will not
22 have a TAG a week from Thursday so by default, it
23 will be the next couple of weeks. And it may require
24 more than one.

25 Thirdly, we have the transcription that
0105

1 will be made available to all parties. And I think
2 that the final on that would be available tomorrow.
3 So we'll end up sending that and posting it.

4 And then the last item I wanted to briefly
5 discuss was the next vendor technical conference.
6 And one of the things that we would like to propose,
7 and we don't have to finalize everything today. I'll
8 just put this out on the table and then we can have
9 it as a TAG discussion item this Thursday. We
10 recently had test 12.8 issued as a discrete. We have
11 three reports due the remainder of this week. That
12 would be test 15, test 18 and test 24.10. And for
13 right now, we're assuming that those are fairly well
14 on schedule.

15 What we're proposing is that we would roll
16 those four tests into a one-day vendor technical
17 conference that would be held after we go through our
18 normal eight days for comments, eight days for final
19 discrete and two or three days for CLEC questions to
20 be submitted or staff questions, and then try to have
21 that one day vendor technical conference around the
22 11th or 12th of April. One of the suggestions from
23 state folks is to have it be the day before the ROC
24 meetings in Santa Fe because then many state folks
25 could attend that, whereas just a one-day trip to

0106
1 Denver would be less -- folks wouldn't be able to
2 justify that. They would have to do it on the
3 bridge.

4 So we're exploring that. I've talked
5 briefly with all the various parties and we'll try
6 and finalize something about this on the TAG call.
7 So I would ask if CLECs -- I think I spoke briefly
8 with Tim about that today. You guys can think about
9 it. I've spoken with Qwest about it. You can think
10 about it, the staffs will. And of course Joe and I
11 chatted about it too.

12 So that would denote that final and third
13 vendor technical conference because that will have
14 all the meat in it. Well, I shouldn't say all the
15 meat. How many times can I get both feet in my mouth
16 in one meeting? But seriously, we have for that
17 final one, we have test 10, test 12 which has all the
18 transaction testing, test 13 which is flow-through,
19 test 14 which is provisioning and 19.0 and 20.0 which
20 are document billing. Oh, and 16.

21 MR. RUTTER: You also want to consider
22 24.8 which may be appropriate for the one day which

23 is not quite yet out.
24 MS. ANDERSON: That's a good point, Brian.
25 Thank you. So anyway, that's the direction we're

0107

1 heading. Any comments regarding this at this moment
2 from anyone?

3 MS. ZENGER: This is Joni in Utah. The
4 only thing is we have to have it on Saturday because
5 the meetings begin on Sunday.

6 MS. ANDERSON: Well, we were thinking of
7 Friday the 12th.

8 MR. WEEKS: I can't do that.

9 MS. ANDERSON: So we could do it maybe
10 Tuesday. Well, we'll work on the specifics. It may
11 not work to do it in Santa Fe but conceptually what
12 we're looking at is getting a one day in that time
13 frame someplace, maybe Santa Fe and maybe elsewhere.
14 So we'll work on perfecting that. We will talk about
15 it on the TAG and see if we can have a list of dates
16 that everybody can make. This is one of those things
17 that we're trying to move it along because we
18 recognize that third one will be a pretty big item.

19 MR. MAY: And for the third one, are you
20 anticipating two days or three days?

21 MS. ANDERSON: We don't know at this time.
22 Details to follow.

23 MS. BALVIN: And Denise, what were the
24 ones for the first technical conference?

25 MS. ANDERSON: 12.8, 15, 18 end-to-end

0108

1 M&R, 24.10 and 24.8 maybe.

2 MR. MAY: And would the venue for the
3 third be Denver, perhaps here, or undecided?

4 MS. ANDERSON: We don't know. At one
5 point, Salt Lake City had offered to host it. In
6 some ways, Denver is a little more central. We're
7 just working on the second one now and we'll try and
8 do what works out best for the third and we will be
9 planning for that as things shape up a little more.

10 MR. FAHN: Are you taking a test about
11 when the third conference will be?

12 MS. ANDERSON: Taking a guess -- yes, I
13 can freely speculate on that. It's going to be in
14 May, but right now it's scheduled for the 6th through
15 the 8th and that may or may not be where we end up.

16 Any other questions?

17 MR. FINNEGAN: Generally the discrete
18 reports so far have been in the tens of pages. Does
19 KPMG have any fearless predictions on the length of
20 the sections that are going to be at the very end.

21 MR. DELLATORRE: Test 14 is big. Test 12
22 will not be, for our section, although the HPC
23 section may be. That's -- 13 is similar to these.
24 19 and 20? 19 is not that long, 19 and 20 is similar

25 to these. I think 14 and 16 may be sizable, just in
0109

1 terms of sheer number of pages.

2 MR. WEEKS: There will be a lot of tables
3 and stuff. The word count, if you take the tables
4 out and look at the word count, it won't be that
5 huge. And a bunch of it will be boilerplate
6 descriptions of how the process works and stuff like
7 that. I'm not trying to minimize that. It takes up
8 space but it's not --

9 MR. DELLATORRE: You'll see test 15 where
10 the review is concise, the criteria are few, but
11 there is lots of supporting information. So it's a
12 mixed bag. But I don't think that the sheer volume
13 of words on a page will be far from what you've seen
14 already except in possibly test 14 and 16.

15 MR. FINNEGAN: And 12 and 13, did you say
16 what your guess was on that?

17 MR. DELLATORRE: Similar size. But
18 consider, though, that there are two reports for test
19 12, both ours and HPC's. And test 12 and 13 would be
20 a little more similar to test 15 where there is more
21 supporting data, tables and whatnot.

22 MR. FINNEGAN: Does HP have any
23 guesstimates on whatever they're producing, the size
24 of the document?

25 MR. MAY: In the 30 page range. 24.8
0110

1 would be smaller. Test 10, in the 30 page range.

2 MR. FINNEGAN: Okay. Thanks.

3 MS. ANDERSON: Any other questions? Okay.
4 I would like to thank KPMG for all their preparation
5 and delivery of the answers. We really appreciate
6 the professional manner in which this was conducted.
7 We really appreciate it. And I would like to thank
8 the CLECs and the state staffs for submitting
9 questions and Qwest for hosting this and for lunch.
10 Your lunch is back there so please stay and have
11 lunch. Some of us will be adjourning to the EC call.
12 Thank you.

13 (The proceedings were completed at 12:03
14 p.m.)

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25