1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10   QWEST OSS 271 VENDOR TECHNICAL CONFERENCE 2

11   Radisson Santa Fe Hotel

12   Santa Fe, New Mexico

13   Tuesday, April 16, 2002

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
 1    APPEARANCES:

 2    AT&T
           JOHN FINNEGAN
 3         MARY TRIBBY
           TIM CONNOLLY
 4
      HPC
 5         DON PETRY
           GEOFF MAY
 6         JEFF CROCKETT
           MARY CEGELSKI
 7         LIZ GRAGERT
           TRICIA PARKER
 8         LEE TRUDEAU
           MAUREEN TICHY
 9         SAMANTHA DARBY
           IONE WILKENS
10         STEVEN KURTZ
           PENNY BAKER
11         BOB FALCONE

12    KPMG
           MIKE WEEKS
13         JOE DELLA TORRE
           BEN HEMPHILL
14         CARRIE THIELEMANN
           CHUCK WOLVERTON
15         ERIC DEL ROSARIO
           JOE GORALSKI
16         JOHN DEAHL
           LIZ FUCCILLO
17         NOLAN DINSMORE
           RUSS GUZDAR
18         TODD SCHERR
           ALAN SALZBERG
19         NICK REDCHUCK
           YLONDA CHESTNEY
20         TERRY TRUDGIEN
           CHANDRA COOMBS
21
      MTG
22         DENISE ANDERSON
           BOB CENTER
23         MARIE BAKUNAS

24

25
```

```
 1   APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):

 2   QWEST
          ANDY CRAIN
 3        BARB BROHL
          CHRIS VIVEROS
 4        LYNN NOTARIANNI
          NANCY LUBAMERSKY
 5        PAT HALBACH
          SCOTT SIMANSON
 6        CHARLES MILLER
          DAN POOLE
 7
     WORLDCOM
 8        BECKY OLIVER
          TOM DIXON
 9
     New Mexico Advocacy Staff
10        MARION BUSTER GRIFFING, Ph.D., QSI Consulting
          MIKE RIPPERGER
11
     OREGON
12        IRV EMMONS

13   WASHINGTON
          DAVE GRIFFITH
14        TOM SPINKS

15   NEBRASKA
          BUSTER GRIFFING
16        DICK PALAZZOLO

17   PSC STAFF

18        MARIE LARSON

19

20

21

22

23

24

25
```

1   P R O C E E D I N G S

2   *   *   *   *   *   *   *

3   MS. ANDERSON: We have our transcriber,

4   Craig, today. He will need whoever is speaking to

5   introduce yourselves, the name and company. We know

6   as the day goes on, we won't have to nag about that.

7   We plan to start right in with Section

8   12.8. There are copies of a consolidated set of

9   questions. There will be a hand-out passed out later

10   to offer some additional data for one of the

11   questions.

12   Folks on the bridge, can you hear us all

13   right?

14   A VOICE: Yes:

15   MS. ANDERSON: Good. We can hear you

16   quite well.

17   A couple additional things. We have a

18   morning break planned and, as you know, there is a

19   continental breakfast in the back room. We will be

20   bringing lunch in so we can take a quick 15-minute

21   break, load your plates up, and we can get back to

22   the questions.

23   If it turns out we are ahead of schedule

24   by some miracle, perhaps we will reevaluate that.

25   But we will definitely be breaking by 3 o'clock for

1 travel plans, as I said earlier.

2   If we proceed through all of these

3 questions and answers, we do have some follow-up

4 items that we would then work on. If we don't get to

5 those, then we will be scheduling some sort of AN

6 addition to a tag call to deal with them, or a

7 special call. We will make that decision a little

8 later.

9   Any questions before we get started?

10   We are going to introduce the vendor folks

11 in a moment, then go right into it.

12   Any questions?

13   (No response.)

14   MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Welcome. I look

15 forward to an educational day.

16   Do you want to go ahead and introduce the

17 head table and supporting table back there? Marie's

18 got the other one.

19   (Introductions.)

20   MS. ANDERSON: With that, let's proceed

21 directly to Section 12.8. Mike and Joe.

22

23

24

25

```
 1    Test 12.8 - POP Manual Order Processing Evaluation

 2             MR. WEEKS:  I will add our welcome to

 3    everyone in the room and everyone on the bridge to

 4    the second vendor technical conference.

 5             We have a large number of questions to go

 6    through today.  We have prepared, we hope, answers

 7    that will satisfy the questions that were asked.

 8             There were some duplicates now and then,

 9    so we will try to cover those as we can.

10             Also, as is the format of this, we will

11    take follow-up questions, if our answer doesn't make

12    sense or there is a little more that you need.

13             If there are questions that you ask that

14    we cannot answer in the course of this, we'll jot

15    them down.

16             We will start with 12.8, POP - Manual

17    Order Processing Evaluation.  The latest and greatest

18    copy of the report, which hopefully you have all had

19    a chance to access, that is dated April 13th.  All

20    the evaluation criteria are sitting currently in a

21    satisfied state.

22             A lot of the questions we are going to get

23    about 12.8 are based on the previous version of the

24    report.  So don't be surprised when we sort of give

25    you an answer that says that section or set of words
```

1   everybody deleted or something.

2   So I know that is a bit confusing; we ran

3   into that in the last conference.

4   But we will have the same situation again

5   with 12.8. The questions are based on a previous

6   version. We will give you the best answers we can

7   based on what we currently know and where the current

8   report is at.

9   I think we are ready to go.

10   MR. DELLA TORRE: Good morning. Question

11   number 1, AT&T: "What is the form of the Functional

12   Acknowledgment that is received for orders submitted

13   by the IMA-GUI?

14   Within the GUI is a pop-up screen with one

15   of two possible statuses. One has a message of okay.

16   It indicates that no BPL errors were detected and an

17   LSR number was assigned to the order.

18   The other possible message is, okay, IMA

19   error, which indicates a BPL error exists on the

20   order preventing it from being (inaudible) and the

21   CLEC subsequently submits the same (inaudible).

22   THE REPORTER: Please keep your voice up,

23   I just can't hear you.

24   Question number 2: "Because CLECs that

25   typically use EDI for LSR submittal may occasionally

1 use manual processes to submit orders, is it KPMG's

2 understanding there is no capability that enables

3 status checking of orders submitted manually?"

4   And that is our understanding.

5   Orders submitted electronically by EDI GUI

6 can be tracked by EDI or GUI. Manually submitted

7 orders can be submitted by calling the Help Desk. We

8 have updated and revised the report with this

9 information.

10   The follow-on question to that is: "Is it

11 KPMG's understanding that CLECs can employ EDI to

12 track status of EDI submitted orders that have

13 dropped to manual processing?"

14   The answer is yes.

15   Question 3: I will jump a little forward

16 into the questions themselves if there is surrounding

17 text, unless someone requests a little more of the

18 text, although I believe everyone has received copies

19 of these questions.

20   The first question is: "Does Qwest's

21 process require that every FOC for LSRs submitted via

22 the EDI interface be manually created by the SDC

23 whether or not the order flowed through into the

24 SOP?"

25   The second question is the same question

1   except for the GUI.

2   The answer is the same in both cases: No.

3   It's not required that the manual create the --

4   specifically for flow-through orders.

5   MR. FINNEGAN: Is this a case where the

6   chart was revised, the flow chart showed --

7   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes.

8   Question number 4: "How would Figure

9   12.8-2 need to change to accommodate Qwest's process

10   for handling non-fatal errors?"

11   We are a little challenged here in

12   presenting a changed diagram. I will try to step

13   through our answer.

14   But, more appropriately, I think we will

15   make some copies of a version of the diagram that I

16   am looking at here that shades particular areas of

17   the diagram to illustrate the answers.

18   In fact, I will go into the error process,

19   or at least our understanding of the error process,

20   in a little more detail, because there are questions

21   from both AT&T and MCI WorldCom, and I think we can

22   knock off a bunch at the same time.

23   MR. FINNEGAN: In the spirit of a picture

24   is worth a thousand words, rather than describe it, I

25   would as soon wait until the copies are out. Is that

1   something that can be done today?

2   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes.

3   MR. WEEKS: We are not revising the

4   diagram. We are just explaining how the diagram

5   reflects what you are asking about, which is the

6   error processing.

7   MS. ANDERSON: Do you want to lone me one?

8   MS. THIELEMANN: I have got one.

9   MR. DELLA TORRE: We can return to

10   question 4 after we have distributed copies of this

11   diagram.

12   So let's move forward with question 5. We

13   will return to this after that information is

14   gathered.

15   "For address validation how does the SDC

16   validate the address?"

17   SDC can use PREMIS to address valuation.

18   Second question, again, it's PREMIS. "For

19   customer name validation how does the SDC validate

20   the name?"

21   The SDC uses BOSS/CARS and can be

22   validated using BOSS/CARS. So both PREMIS and

23   BOSS/CARS can be used by the SDCs.

24   The follow-on question. "Do the SDCs

25   follow the same procedure for validating customer

1   name and customer address as Qwest recommends the

2   CLEC follow in CLEC documentation?"

3   It's really sort of a partial answer.

4   CLECs using IMA to submit orders will validate names

5   and addresses using IMA to access PREMIS and

6   BOSS/CARS.

7   However, manually submitted orders, they

8   can get CSR information by adding faxing of request

9   or dialing several different phone numbers that are

10   offered that will connect them to the CSR

11   representative.

12   As a final comment, that is not a parity

13   evaluation. We are providing that information in

14   response to the question.

15   MR. FINNEGAN: Follow-up question. This

16   gets into the consistency between databases.

17   If the CLEC is doing the CSR retrieval as

18   the way of validating the customer's name and that

19   CSR retrieval is accessing, I believe it's BOSS/CARS,

20   and the SDC can validate the name using either

21   BOSS/CARS or PREMIS. There is a potential the CLEC

22   order could be rejected because of inconsistencies

23   between the name in PREMIS and name in BOSS/CARS.

24   The CLEC would have done everything right

25   but still gotten a rejected order because the name

1   was not the same.

2   Can that situation occur?

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: For manually submitted

4   orders it would likely be more possible, because

5   there are means at a CLEC's disposal if they are

6   using electronic --

7   MR. FINNEGAN: What I am saying is, if the

8   CLEC uses electronic interface, uses BOSS/CARS to

9   validate the name, but from an SDC's perspective it's

10   optional whether they validate with PREMIS or

11   validate with BOSS/CARS, the back end manual order

12   processing is inconsistent from the preferred

13   approach or recommended approach to the CLECs and it

14   could result in cases where perfectly good CLEC

15   orders are rejected, not because of an invalid name

16   but because the SDC used PREMIS to validate the name

17   instead of BOSS/CARS.

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: While your premise --

19   while your hypothesis seems logical and reasonable,

20   we didn't validate the underlying data in BOSS/CARS

21   and compare that to PREMIS.

22   We also did not do a parity evaluation of

23   the functionality offered to CLEC versus how

24   (inaudible) checking names.

25   So we really can't make a comment on

1 whether or not we have seen that situation occur.

2   MR. WEEKS: Would someone from Qwest like

3 to comment?

4   This is Chris Viveros from Qwest.

5   MR. VIVEROS: John, KPMG is correct in

6 that, certainly, the SDCs can use either PREMIS or

7 BOSS to seek the customer name on an account.

8   The fact of the matter is that that

9 information is the listed name on the account and

10 that is driven from the service order. The service

11 order drives the population in PREMIS and it drives

12 the population in BOSS/CARS.

13   Certainly there could be a conflict if you

14 were looking at two different accounts in those

15 sources.

16   But if you are looking at an active

17 account as in a conversion scenario, the listed name

18 in PREMIS would be the same as the listed name in

19 BOSS/CARS.

20   Further, if for some reason there was a

21 conflict as far as the name on the LSR, the SDCs

22 would be looking to resolve that conflict before

23 issuing either a non-fatal error notice or reject to

24 the CLEC.

25   So my expectation would be that they would

1 be checking both sources to ensure there wasn't a

2 conflict.

3   MR. WEEKS: Chris, is that true not only

4 for name but for address, as well?

5   In other jurisdictions we have seen

6 situations where CRIS and PREMIS are out of sync with

7 each other. It's less often on the name, but more

8 often on the address.

9   MR. VIVEROS: And on address, the

10 inconsistencies I am familiar with have more to do

11 with format.

12   And the fact that some old CSRs don't

13 conform to the (inaudible) standard format that we've

14 got --

15   MR. WEEKS: Exactly. That's what we would

16 see if we did a pre-order for a pull-down name and

17 address validating name and address using CHRIS, drop

18 it into the LSR. PREMIS would catch it on an address

19 error.

20   MR. VIVEROS: We recommend that address

21 validation be done on all those orders. That would

22 be done against PREMIS, so we would be expecting a

23 PREMIS formatted address to come in on the LSR and it

24 would be using PREMIS to validate the address.

25   MR. FINNEGAN: Why wouldn't it be as

1   simple to make it a business rule to always validate

2   the customer name through BOSS/CARS? That would

3   avoid any potential conflict.

4   If the information is or should be

5   equivalent, the way of avoiding, completely,

6   inconsistency between a customer name that the CLEC

7   has validated and one the SDC has validated is to

8   access the same database.

9   MR. VIVEROS: I am sorry, John. I missed

10   the middle part of your statement.

11   MR. FINNEGAN: Why not just make it a

12   standard operating procedure for the SDC to always

13   use BOSS/CARS to validate a name? That would avoid

14   the potential conflict entirely.

15   MR. VIVEROS: Well, I am not sure we have

16   a conflict.

17   We have a piece of information, listed

18   name, available in multiple sources. And as they are

19   checking multiple pieces of data they are going into

20   various databases. They are looking for a match.

21   Certainly if, in fact, there is a discrepancy between

22   the name that is used on the CLEC's LSR and the data

23   they are seeing, we expect them to investigate that

24   further as opposed to simply rejecting that back to

25   the CLEC.

1   So they are using all the information that

2   is available to them to determine whether or not

3   there is a conflict or not.

4   MR. WEEKS: If I could, I would like to

5   move on, since the primary reason for the

6   conversation is the report as opposed to talking

7   about how to redesign systems.

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: Just as a request to

9   those folks on the bridge, could you all mute your

10 phones, please, just to avoid occasional noise.

11 Thank you.

12   I believe we are up on question number 6.

13   "Provide KPMG's understanding of Qwest's

14 fatal and non-fatal rejects, as contrasted with fatal

15 and non-fatal errors."

16   It's our understanding those are one and

17 the same.

18   "What is KPMG's evaluation of these

19 processes that deal specifically with manual order

20 processing of LSRs that have been classified as fatal

21 and non-fatal rejects?"

22   Non-fatals, they are a notice that is sent

23 to the CLEC. It is not a rejection of the order,

24 it's a notice sent to the CLEC.

25   If that is not responded to within four

1 hours, then a fatal error or rejection, rather, will

2 be sent back to the CLEC.

3   I would point folks to our evaluation

4 criteria, 12.8-8, that discusses our evaluation of

5 the error process.

6   Additionally, as a follow-on to that, the

7 question asks specifically for manual orders. It's

8 our understanding there is no difference in error

9 processing for manual orders versus non-flow-through

10 manually handled orders.

11   Follow-on question: "How is the non-fatal

12 reject process similar to the non-fatal error

13 process?"

14   I think I just described that a moment

15 ago.

16   Question 7 --

17   MR. CONNOLLY: Excuse me. Tim Connelly,

18 AT&T.

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: Certainly.

20   MR. CONNOLLY: KPMG uses non-fatal rejects

21 and non-fatal errors interchangeably; is that

22 correct? Do I understand?

23   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes.

24   MR. CONNOLLY: Can Qwest clarify they do

25 the same thing? The question is rooted in the recent

1   modifications for PO2, where we talk about excluding

2   non-fatal rejects.

3   Are you treating rejects and errors the

4   same?

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: May I expand before the

6   Qwest response? I want to make sure that the

7   difference is noted between an error for non-fatal

8   and by a reject, if you mean the notice, the

9   non-fatal reject notice that's sent. So there is

10   really a condition versus a response.

11   So if that's a distinction, we certainly

12   do make those distinctions that there is a non-fatal

13   error condition that results in a non-fatal notice

14   that is sent to a CLEC that can then lead to a fatal

15   error and reject of that order, if the CLEC does not

16   respond.

17   So there are sort -- there are differences

18   between them. I hope we articulate that clearly.

19   MR. VIVEROS: We agree with Mr. Della

20   Torre's description. We have on occasion not been as

21   distinct and clear as we probably should be.

22   There are non-fatal and fatal error

23   conditions. One results in a phone fatal notice, the

24   other results in a reject notice.

25   With respect specifically to PO2, our

1   intent on the modification of the measure was to

2   exclude those LSRs that failed flow-through due to a

3   non-fatal error condition where a notice had been

4   sent to the CLEC.

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: Other questions?

6   Question number 7: "Under what

7   conditions, if any, do Qwest's internal procedures

8   require the SDC to attempt to resolve non-fatal

9   errors by calling the CLEC for corrective action?"

10   As stated in our report and Qwest's

11   documentation SDCs are responsible for sending

12   non-fatal error notices and those notices are sent

13   through an electronic interface.

14   There is no requirement that the SDC place

15   a call to the CLEC.

16   MR. FINNEGAN: We should understand if the

17   SDC does make a call out of the goodness of their

18   heart, they are not required to do so and we should

19   not expect phone calls from the SDC to attempt to

20   resolve non-fatal errors as a standard operating

21   procedure?

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: That is our

23   understanding.

24   Question 8. "How does the non-specific

25   regularly scheduled quality review process compare

1 with the specifically scheduled productivity review

2 process relative to the SDCs?"

3   There are formal reviews and ongoing

4 reviews between certain periods of time. Some of the

5 ongoing reviews would include random ticket pulls at

6 10 percent per total orders per month, per rep, for

7 quality analysis. With feedback provided

8 immediately.

9   Results are used as part of both monthly,

10 quarterly and annual overall performance reviews.

11 There are reviews conducted of SCD productivity and

12 there are ongoing reviews to evaluate performance

13 measurements around order accuracy and rep

14 productivity.

15   "Does the lack of specific quality review

16 schedules have a coincidental relationship with the

17 requirements for SDC Coaching?"

18   I was wondering if AT&T could provide a

19 little bit more explanation or clarification on that

20 question.

21   MR. CONNOLLY: Sure. Would it be KPMG's

22 opinion that a regularly scheduled, perhaps monthly,

23 performance review would have a likelihood of

24 decreasing -- likelihood of decreasing volume of

25 incidents which result in a need for coaching by the

1 ISE Coaches?

2   MR. DELLA TORRE: To address the premise

3 rather than our opinion, it's our understanding Qwest

4 already does have regularly scheduled performance

5 reviews on both daily, monthly, and quarterly, and

6 annually:

7   MR. CONNOLLY: Thanks.

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 9. "Please

9 describe the order accuracy measurement Qwest uses to

10 measure the performance of SDCs."

11   We will provide examples of the order

12 accuracy measurements. Qwest employs an analysis

13 quality review form based on product type which

14 examines fields such as AP date and SPOKO remarks, et

15 cetera.

16   There is also a second tool used, known as

17 the "25-item Checklist," which monitors for the

18 presence of PON, correct TN, G remarks, et cetera.

19 These are identified in our evaluation criteria

20 12.8-3.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: Follow-up question. John

22 Finnegan.

23   Do they compare an LSR to a service order?

24   MR. DELLA TORRE: We are not aware of that

25 performance evaluation.

1   MR. FINNEGAN: So the order accuracy would

2   look, would focus just on the service order?

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: I believe it focuses on

4   the LSR.

5   Actually, that doesn't make sense.

6   My apology. The LSR is received and they

7   enter the order as a service order which then is

8   reviewed, based on product type, for a variety of

9   fields.

10   MR. FINNEGAN: So if an SDC was typing an

11   order, just forgot to add a feature that was

12   requested on the LSR, would this service order

13   accuracy measure, or more specifically the quality

14   review form of the 25-item Checklist identify that

15   error.

16   MS. ANDERSON: For folks on the bridge, we

17   have a caucus occurring.

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: Okay, I think I have a

19   better understanding of these. The responsibility

20   lies with the SDC to do the LSR to service order

21   quality evaluation.

22   On the quarterly or period end, because

23   there are a variety of periods, the coaches are

24   reviewing from the service order only, not a

25   comparison between the service order and LSR.

1   MR. FINNEGAN: So in effect the SDC is

2   checking his or her own work to make sure what was on

3   the LSR ended up on the service order?

4   MR. DELLA TORRE: There are limited number

5   of, quote, buddy checks that also take place.

6   MR. FINNEGAN: Okay. And sounds like if I

7   am understanding it, the primary aspect is to look at

8   a service order to make sure business rules were

9   followed when due dates were assigned or information

10   that the SDC may create or send back to the CLEC is

11   accurate?

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: That is our

13   understanding.

14   MR. GRIFFING: Buster Griffing, New Mexico

15   Advocacy Staff.

16   When you check the service order quality

17   is it a sample of the work or every order the SDC has

18   turned out?

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: Our understanding is

20   these reviews are conducted on a sample.

21   MS. ANDERSON: I would like to suggest

22   would folks take a moment and turn their cell phones

23   and pagers off so we have a little less distraction?

24   Thank you.

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: Other questions?

1   Question number 10: "Please describe the

2   call handling performance that Qwest uses to measure

3   the performance of SDC."

4   Again, to cite an example, Qwest employs a

5   12-point checklist that includes an evaluation of

6   remarks completion, system notes input, timely ticket

7   handling.

8   There is a consultant behavior quality

9   review form, which evaluates establishing personal

10   connection, identification of problem and technical

11   quality, again, criteria 12.8-3.

12   MR. FINNEGAN: Follow-up. John Finnegan.

13   Is this something where there are coaches

14   listening in?

15   Some of the evaluations seem subjective,

16   establishing the relationship with the CLEC on the

17   phone. That would appear to be a case where they are

18   listening in.

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes. There is a quality

20   analysis team that will monitor calls.

21   Question 11: "Please indicate the

22   specific PID results that are based upon ISC

23   productivity and quality reports."

24   There are none based on productivity and

25   quality reports. There are PIDs related to manual

1   order processing.

2   MR. FINNEGAN: Follow-up question. I may

3   be off on the version. I am looking at the April 1st

4   version. But there is a sentence that reads: These

5   measurements are also compiled into product -- 12.8.9

6   of the April 1st version, Section 2.7.67.

7   MS. THIELEMANN: And the title?

8   MR. FINNEGAN: Performance measurement.

9   The third paragraph begins with the

10   sentence: These measurements are also compiled into

11   product and ISC productivity and quality reports.

12   These data are used as the basis for SDC evaluation,

13   capacity management and executive reports, public ROC

14   271 OSS task service performance result reports that

15   correspond to performance indicator definitions are

16   also available on Qwest's web site.

17   The fact that that reference was in the

18   same paragraph appeared to provide some linkage.

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: Absolutely. And there

20   is no linkage. Those are separate sentences that

21   probably would be better stated as separate

22   paragraphs.

23   We are listing several different sets of

24   reports, one of which does not necessarily feed the

25   other. So we can change that.

1   MR. WEEKS: For those -- the April 13th

2   version of the report, that was Section 2.1.8,

3   performance measurement on page 12.8-11.

4   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 12. "Are the

5   Service Performance Results Reports those that are

6   published monthly to reflect Qwest's performance

7   against the PIDs?"

8   The answer is yes.

9   Question 13. "Please describe what, if

10   any, information was obtained from HP on HP's

11   experience as to whether or not Qwest was following

12   the procedures for processing manually submitted

13   orders."

14   First, a point of fact. HPC would not be

15   able to evaluate Qwest's adherence to processes.

16   Second --

17   MR. WEEKS: Protocol, yes; process, no.

18   Process is inside the wall, black box. HP can't at

19   all see what Qwest is doing all day every day inside

20   the walls of Qwest. They can see whether the

21   protocol has been established for the order in which

22   things should happen, time in which things should

23   happen, so on. They can see that as an outsider.

24   MR. FINNEGAN: Let me give an illustrative

25   example. Let's say the Qwest process called for a

1   non-fatal reject notice to be sent when a non-fatal

2   error condition or non-fatal notice to be sent when a

3   non-fatal error is received and the SDC is not

4   following that process and HPC hasn't received any

5   non-fatal error notices.

6   MR. WEEKS: Then they would see the

7   violation of the protocol, but they wouldn't know

8   what process was followed or not followed by the rep.

9   Maybe we are working in semantics here. You are

10   saying process, I am saying protocol and we mean the

11   same thing.

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: If I may, though, given

13   the example that you set up, the end result is the

14   only thing that HPC would know, that they were not

15   receiving non-fatal notices. The cause of that they

16   would not know.

17   In fact, the SDC may have been adhering to

18   process and for some reason the gateway was down,

19   there was something in the electronics that was

20   permitting that to be submitted. While the SDC may

21   have been following processes for creating and

22   sending non-fatal notices, that does not necessarily

23   mean that they were received by the CLEC.

24   Similarly, a CLEC that does not receive

25   any given response cannot conclude that a particular

1   individual or process within Qwest is not being

2   adhered to.

3   MR. FINNEGAN: And I am not suggesting

4   that. But the evaluation criteria also gets somewhat

5   into whether the process is being followed. The

6   process will produce an output, HPC will have some

7   visibility into the output. They are not going to

8   understand the whole picture, because they are not

9   looking behind the curtain.

10   But in terms of information, that will

11 allow KPMG to ascertain the adherence to the process.

12 That would appear to be a relevant and readily

13 available source of information.

14   MR. WEEKS: Just as a matter of how we

15 normally conduct tests, when we do a white box test,

16 which is inside the walls walk-around and evaluation,

17 those results are contained in sort of a manual

18 process test like if the pseudo CLEC through its

19 black box testing notices the system isn't behaving

20 in a correct way those problems and issues are

21 brought up in the context of the black box test,

22 transaction test.

23   Sometimes, but not often, we will

24 cross-walk between the two in terms of how we report

25 the information. So, had HP experienced, and we all

1 know they did, disorderly notices and things like

2 that within the test, it wouldn't necessarily appear

3 in this report. It will appear in the Test 12

4 Report.

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: In fact, there were

6 appearances here and the next point to my response to

7 this question was that what KPMG Consulting did, in

8 terms of evaluating HP, my apologies, in terms of

9 monitoring and incorporating HPC's findings, the

10 primary tool was to monitor HPC's publication of

11 observations and exceptions.

12   In this case or more specifically, in

13 others, including the one just cited by Mike, which

14 was out-of-sequence order processing, KPMG did note

15 the exceptions raised by HPC Consulting, and then

16 proceeded to do additional white box investigation of

17 changes and fixes implemented by the company in

18 response to HPC's exceptions.

19   So specifically, there was the issue with

20 the process for adhering to creation and commission

21 of FOCs by SDCs. I believe that was our Exception of

22 the out-of-sequence Exception and series that I think

23 we reference later in one of your questions, we will

24 get to it at some point, it did cause KPMG Consulting

25 to do additional analysis within the walls of Qwest

1   while HPC continued to do analysis from outside.

2   MR. FINNEGAN: That was partly the genesis

3   of the question. In 12.8.2 in footnote 2 there is

4   reference to several HPC exceptions and observations

5   that led us to believe you were throughout this

6   evaluation --

7   MR. DELLA TORRE: Absolutely.

8   MR. FINNEGAN: -- looking at what some of

9   HPC's findings were. In 12.8.1 or dash 1, it doesn't

10   appear to have that same information from an HPC

11   perspective. This was a question of why was it in

12   12.8-2 but not -1.

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: I believe the

14   distinction is manually submitted orders. There was

15   a very specific subset of orders that would be

16   qualified as manually submitted versus --

17   Excuse me.

18   (Cell phone interruption.)

19   That is why we do reference HP exceptions

20   for non-flow-through orders but that specific set of

21   orders that were manual orders, there were no

22   exceptions raised by HP --

23   MR. FINNEGAN: Couldn't that have helped

24   form the basis of your conclusion? If it was a

25   positive conclusion and you talked to HP and HP's

1 perspective was for manually submitted orders,

2 everything from their perspective looked like it was

3 done as it should be done, that could have formed the

4 conclusion. It doesn't necessarily always have to be

5 negative information.

6   MR. WEEKS: Understood. What we will do

7 is take under advisement whether we had specific

8 conversations with HP about specific manual order

9 processing issues.

10   If we did or didn't, certainly that could

11 be added here, that no problems were identified by

12 HPC in this area.

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: Actually, as a matter of

14 course, we do not identify where we do not find

15 problems.

16   MR. WEEKS: There is a concept in auditing

17 called negative assurance, and we try to avoid that

18 in general, but we didn't see a problem kinds of

19 things. Leads one to believe everything is okay.

20 Usually we try to avoid statements like that. But I

21 understand your point.

22   MR. FINNEGAN: It's more so from, in this

23 case, did you not do it at all or did you do it, not

24 find any problems.

25   MR. WEEKS: We will clarify the report on

1   this point.

2   MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: I believe that

4   conversation effectively covered HPC's position, but

5   rather than speak for them, this is one of several

6   questions we may or will defer a portion or the

7   question in its entirety to HPC.

8   Geoff, anything to add?

9   MR. MAY: No. I would concur with HPC's

10   explanation and the wording of the question, which it

11   appears to ask whether or not HP believed that Qwest

12   followed its own internal procedures. We would have

13   no visibility into that. I think that is what has

14   been said.

15   If we were to observe something on our

16   side of the house, we would issue an Observation and

17   Exception, and did.

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 14. Very

19   similar question, but actual commercial CLECs versus

20   HPC for the manual order process: "Please describe

21   what if any information was obtained from HP on HP's

22   experience as to whether or not Qwest was following

23   the procedures for processing manually submitted

24   orders."

25   Actual customer CLECs versus HPC for the

1 manual order process, any inputs KPMG Consulting

2 used.

3   Response is KPMG did QC electronic input.

4 However the CLECs that responded to our request for

5 input and were subsequently interviewed did not

6 submit orders manually. Therefore, the two follow-on

7 questions are not applicable.

8   Question 15. "Please describe what, if

9 any, information was obtained from HP on Hp's

10 experience as to whether or not Qwest was following

11 the processes and procedures for manual order

12 inquiries and escalations."

13   And again, to return to the discussion we

14 had moments ago, as a matter of course KPMG

15 Consulting monitored the observations and exceptions

16 issued by HPC Consulting, or rather HPC.

17   In this case Exception 2075 was related to

18 the order inquiry process. I would ask if you wish

19 more information to reference the OE lock.

20   As a result, KPMG conducted additional

21 interviews and observations on the site and

22 additional documentation analysis to determine that

23 procedures were in place and amended as necessary to

24 address CLEC inquiries and escalations. Eventually,

25 2075 was closed.

1   HP, other points to that?

2   MR. MAY: No, we concur with that

3   explanation.

4   MR. DELLA TORRE: Thank you, Geoff.

5   Question 16: Same question but CLECs

6   rather than HPC.

7   During our interviews with CLECs, the

8   CLECs reported the process was adhered to.

9   However, we will make the same point we

10   made moments ago, that the CLEC would not know that

11   it was, in fact, adhered to. We presume that to mean

12   the outputs conformed with their expectations.

13   There was also representation the CLECs

14   were generally satisfied with their experience with

15   the call center and CSIE.

16   Question 17: "Please describe what, if

17   any, information was obtained from HP on HP's

18   experience as to whether or not Qwest was following

19   the procedures for processing electronically

20   submitted non-flow through orders."

21   So we have essentially changed subject

22   matters, similar format. Now non-flow through

23   orders.

24   Similar answer. KPMG Consulting monitored

25   observations and exceptions raised by HPC. This is

1   where the series of disorderly orders, if you will,

2   were raised. That caused additional retesting on

3   both vendors' parts.

4   We did additional white box testing, HPC

5   did additional transaction testing. All of the

6   related exceptions including Exception 3078 which was

7   subsequently issued by KPMG on the processing of

8   manual PODS were closed.

9   Mr. May?

10   MR. MAY: I would concur with that

11   explanation and record and issue observations and

12   exceptions on what we see on our side of the house.

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 18. "Please

14   describe what, if any, information was obtained from

15   CLEC interviews on the CLECs experience as to whether

16   or not Qwest was following the procedures for

17   processing non-flow through orders."

18   There was concurrence from the CLECs

19   during our interviews with the experience of

20   disorderly orders. And, therefore, that became the

21   focus of our retest evaluation and investigation.

22   And ultimately those exceptions were closed.

23   Question 19. "For Exception 2030, the

24   Disposition Report states, 'HP queried Qwest as to

25   potential PID impacts and why the subsequent fatals

1   do not reflect defined Qwest process of issuing

2   non-fatal rejections after issuance of a FOC. At the

3   direction of MTG and KPMG on Focus Call, HP withdrew

4   the question as 'out of scope' given the 95 percent

5   successful processing rate.' .

6   Please provide the specific direction from

7   MTG and KPMG provided to HP. Absent the direction

8   from MTG and KPMG, would HP have left the Exception

9   open until Qwest provided a response to HP's query?"

10   I will turn the question over to Mr. May.

11   MR. MAY: I would state this discussion

12 and direction took place on an open ROC, that is a

13 focus observation exception call. I don't think this

14 particular issue is complicated.

15   Generally speaking, the pseudo CLEC is

16 oblivious to PID results and benchmarks. We view our

17 role as to record what happens in the pseudo CLEC

18 experience.

19   So, in this case, where we were

20 essentially raising whatever we saw, and we had the

21 test administrator, who by test design has in its

22 scope measurements and benchmarks and the like, we

23 basically just deferred to that direction.

24   Follow-up on that?

25   MR. FINNEGAN: Was this a case where the

1   direction was the results had met KPMG's benchmark,

2   so there was no need to focus on the 5 percent or

3   so --

4   MR. MAY: I believe it was 44 out of 3770.

5   MS. ANDERSON: Which is 1.2 percent.

6   MR. FINNEGAN: So the 1.2 percent

7   direction from KPMG was performance met their

8   benchmark, so there was no need to continue any

9   investigation on the 1.4 percent?

10   MR. DELLA TORRE: No, that is not correct.

11 That benchmark was not established by KPMG

12 Consulting.

13   HPC would open and close issues based on

14 HPC's standards and criteria.

15   In this particular case it was passive.

16   MR. FINNEGAN: Whose benchmark was this,

17 was it KPMG's, was it HP's?

18   MR. MAY: It was HP's for the purpose of

19 the retest. That was -- those were the results that

20 we were looking for.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: So was this a reminder from

22 MPG and KPMG that the benchmark, the HP benchmark had

23 been achieved, there was no need to focus on the

24 1.4 percent?

25   MR. MAY: Yes, I would agree with that.

1   MS. ANDERSON: This is Denise Anderson

2   from MPG.

3   I believe from MPG's perspective it was a

4   situation of the standard is not perfection, in the

5   situation where the vendor had indicated that

6   95 percent was the vendor-established objective and

7   we have a situation where it's 1.2 percent, it has

8   more than exceeded the vendor's benchmark. And it

9   seemed an inappropriate way to use resources, when we

10   still had many other items to work on.

11   MPG's guidance was as indicated, to remind

12   the vendor that it had not only passed but exceeded

13   the benchmark.

14   MS. OLIVER: Before you move on - Becky

15   Oliver, WorldCom - I would like to back up and ask a

16   follow-up question if I may on question 16.

17   My question is, how many CLECs did KPMG

18   talk to when conducting these interviews?

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: First, all CLECs

20   participating in the early establishment of this task

21   were asked on several occasions in writing and phone

22   calls publicly to participate in various elements of

23   this task. I believe there is a well-documented

24   history of requests for CLEC participation.

25   In this particular instance three CLECs

1   were solicited and two ultimately would participate.

2   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: You are welcome.

4   Question 20 doesn't actually relate to

5   KPMG Consulting at all, so I will turn it over to

6   Geoff May, HPC.

7   MR. MAY: This is similar to question 19.

8   I think it's generally the same scenario. So again,

9   this was a publicly noticed TAG focused on an E call.

10 And I believe in this case this was a KPMG benchmark

11 and the benchmark --

12   No? Was it ours?

13   Okay, so it was another case where we had

14 set the benchmark for the retest and the benchmark

15 was satisfied.

16   MR. FINNEGAN: So what would you describe

17 as the numerator of this measure?

18   MR. MAY: That would be the 3770.

19   MR. FINNEGAN: These are -- then

20 represented --

21   MR. MAY: The transactional retest from

22 December 1st. All original and supplemental LSRs

23 from December through January.

24   MR. FINNEGAN: This was from the point

25 where Qwest said they fixed whatever hiccup they had

1   in their system. These 3070 represented the original

2   LSRs and supplemental LSRs that were after that, and

3   subtracted from that and the numerator, I would

4   assume, would be the ones that didn't conform to the

5   process?

6   MR. MAY: 44. Right. Correct.

7   MR. FINNEGAN: The denominator was the --

8   MR. MAY: 3770. I apologize, you asked

9   for the numerator and I gave you the denominator.

10   MR. FINNEGAN: The 3770 was before the

11   subtraction of the 44?

12   MR. MAY: Correct.

13   MR. FINNEGAN: Were there any exclusions

14   in that?

15   MR. MAY: There were no exclusions.

16   MR. FINNEGAN: Maybe you said it before.

17   How was the 95 percent benchmark established?

18   MR. MAY: In the absence of a performance

19   indicator definition, again, we set the benchmark to

20   provide a basis for success or failure in the retest.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: Geoff, question 21 and

23   22 are also directed essentially to HPC.

24   MR. MAY: Geoff from HP. Again, these are

25   very similar situations to those we have just

1   discussed.

2   And in general, our response would be the

3   same. If you have additional follow-up questions on

4   these two instances, I would try to address that.

5   MR. FINNEGAN: When you say the two

6   instances are you adding question 22 into that?

7   MR. MAY: Correct.

8   MR. FINNEGAN: On 22 you just looked at

9   violations of the sequence in general, you didn't

10 have a specific benchmark for, say, A, an error that

11 was there was an FOC received then a fatal reject

12 versus an error condition where there were two FOCs

13 sent then a fatal reject. You just counted in the 44

14 any disorderly order status notes.

15   MR. MAY: This disorderly order retest

16 was pursuant to Exceptions 2030 through 2037.

17   As Don has whispered in my ear, there were

18 various flavors of disorderly orders. So each flavor

19 was subjected to the same retest.

20   MR. FINNEGAN: That I understand. But

21 let's say there was five flavors and it was a one and

22 a half -- I will make it easier, 2 percent occurrence

23 of each error on the 5. You may have had 98 percent

24 success on that specific occurrence, but in total you

25 had 10 percent of disorderly order status notices.

1   So the question was getting at is that

2   allowance of 5 percent applied generally to any

3   flavor of order status, disorderly order status

4   notice, or does it apply to each specific flavor?

5   MR. MAY: Both.

6   MR. FINNEGAN: So that 44 included every

7   flavor?

8   MR. MAY: I could run through the

9   exceptions and give you the numerators by flavor, if

10   you wish. And denominators.

11   MR. FINNEGAN: I don't think I necessarily

12   need that as much as the 44 that we had talked about,

13   and I asked the question, is that all of the flavors,

14   and the answer was no. If I added all of the flavors

15   of disorderly order status notice would that be a

16   number higher than 44?

17   MR. MAY: It would be higher than 44, but

18   still less than 5 percent.

19   MR. FINNEGAN: Is there anyplace in the

20   report where it identifies what the number would be?

21   Or is that in the specific exceptions?

22   MR. MAY: Correct. Responses, you would

23   find those in the disposition reports for each

24   individual Exception.

25   MR. FINNEGAN: So that 44 we were talking

1 about in the prior question, that would have been

2 just related to --

3   MR. MAY: Exception 2030.

4   MR. FINNEGAN: 2030. And we could go back

5 individually and find out what that number --

6   MR. MAY: I have them right here if you

7 want, the numerators and denominators.

8   MR. FINNEGAN: You could dumb it down a

9 bit for me and just give me the 44 plus number.

10   MR. DELLA TORRE: Good man.

11   MR. WEEKS: While they do it, should we

12 move to the next question?

13   MR. FINNEGAN: Somewhere between 44 and

14 less than 5 percent?

15   MR. MAY: Yes. Okay. Moving on.

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question number 23.

17 Mike Weeks.

18   MR. WEEKS: I would like to add a question

19 here. Was AT&T asking for an opinion question, which

20 ones might permit kind of if you were to dream your

21 dream, which ones would? Or is this a question of

22 fact, which ones actually do and that we observed

23 during the course of the test?

24   As you are well aware, there is an MTP

25 change for an adequacy study of performance measures

1   over manual order processing.

2   So, if that is sort of the question being

3   asked here, I would ask you to hold off and read our

4   response or our document that's the adequacies, if

5   you are really asking which ones does Qwest use

6   that -- today, that are already in place and already

7   implemented that cover off these kinds of topics.

8   MR. FINNEGAN: I think that was what we

9   were getting at. This issue identified in these

10   exceptions appeared to be one that potentially

11   slipped through the performance measurement crack and

12   would not be captured with the existing performance

13   measurements.

14   MR. WEEKS: I think question 23 can

15   probably be best answered by reading our written

16   document that we are going to prepare for the

17   adequacy study. If I could indulge you to please

18   wait and read that document when it comes out, I

19   think that would answer what you are trying to get at

20   here.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: That would be fine.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: I will put 24 back to

23   Geoff May.

24   MR. MAY: The question is, "For Exception

25   2075 as recently as March 8, 2002, HP was identifying

1   problems with the support that the help desk was

2   providing on order inquiries and escalations.

3   "In HP's final summary for Exception 2075,

4   HP stated, 'HP has documented over the past several

5   months, multiple concerns regarding the support from

6   the Qwest Help Desk.

7   As stated in its responses Qwest has

8   instituted a number of efforts... to improve the

9   quality of services provided. At this time, HP

10   acknowledges Qwest's statements and actions to

11   address the items in this Exception.' While HP,

12   quote, 'acknowledges Qwest's statements and actions

13   to address the items in this Exception,' HP

14   apparently made no attempt to verify that 'Qwest's

15   statements and actions to address the items in this

16   Exception' actually upgraded the quality of Qwest's

17   Help Desk support to acceptable levels."

18   The question is, "Please describe the

19   efforts undertaken by HP to determine if Qwest's

20   statements and actions to address the items in this

21   Exception upgraded the quality of Qwest's Help Desk

22   to acceptable levels.

23   If HP did undertake such efforts, please

24   indicate how HP was able to determine that the

25   support from Qwest's Help Desk improved from

1   unacceptable to acceptable levels."

2   Again, HP in the role of the CLEC could

3   not verify internal processes and procedures

4   identified by Qwest. HP acknowledged Qwest's

5   statements and continued to document any instances of

6   noncompliance, i.e., met, not met. HPC would be

7   prepared -- excuse me.

8   (Pause.)

9   MR. MAY: So again, our visibility in

10   terms of verifying processes and procedures which are

11   internal to Qwest is out of scope.

12   MR. FINNEGAN: Well, that is what puzzled

13   us. This was somewhat of a white box evaluation

14   where, from a pseudo CLEC perspective, there were

15   troubles with the information or help received from

16   the Help Desk.

17   In responding to it there were references

18   made to MCCs, QA, training, coaching, disciplinary

19   action, process improvements, documentation updates,

20   et cetera. Those are all black box type of

21   responses.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: The only way you would

23   know about MCCs and what-not would be --

24   MR. FINNEGAN: I got my colors mixed up.

25   (Laughter.)

1   MR. FINNEGAN: I used to be dyslexic, but

2   now I am KO.

3   This was a black box test. The response

4   was a white box response. And there seemed to be

5   acknowledgment that Qwest had made these white box

6   response type of improvements which seemed somewhat

7   out of bounds for the pseudo CLEC black box type

8   evaluation.

9   MR. MAY: Well except for in our response

10   we state that should we receive additional instances

11   of the same problem, those would be recorded. Right.

12   We didn't state that we had verified, we

13   state that we acknowledge that Qwest has stated that

14   they have implemented these improvements.

15   MR. FINNEGAN: But consistent with past

16   practice, that would seem to point more towards a

17   close, unresolved, or close, unable to determine.

18   MR. MAY: Only if we saw additional

19   instances of the same problem.

20   MR. FINNEGAN: But I think you had an

21   obligation to verify that the fix didn't produce the

22   intended effect and there had been no observations

23   one way or the other. You don't know if the fix

24   worked or didn't work because there were no

25   observations.

1   (Pause.)

2   MS. ANDERSON: For folks on the bridge,

3   there is a caucus going on.

4   (Pause.)

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: Just as two points of

6   clarification. First, this may help big. KPMG

7   Consulting did do the white box testing and

8   verification validation of Qwest assertions made in

9   these particular responses, things like the MCCs and

10   coaching and documentation revisions and the like.

11   Furthermore, in HPC's position, there are

12   several activities that we attempt to observe

13   throughout the course of testing and this was

14   typically, if you participated in the O&E calls over

15   the last several months, there was a category of O&E

16   called monitoring.

17   That category was specifically designed

18   for a situation like this, where you may or may not

19   be able to cause a situation to occur. And

20   therefore, while you looked for it throughout the

21   remaining period, there is no assurance that it will

22   happen.

23   I would point to say delay days or

24   jeopardies as being similar activities where we don't

25   necessarily have the data to represent performance on

1   that, because there weren't enough jeopardies or

2   delay days.

3   And this may be a very similar position,

4   where HP did make attempts from issuance of this

5   Exception throughout the conclusion of testing by the

6   way, so there was a wide window, that they did

7   monitor for this behavior and they just did not see a

8   reoccurrence of the problems.

9   So there was an attempt to monitor it from

10   a transaction perspective and there was actual

11   concrete work done from the process perspective.

12   MR. FINNEGAN: I think the concern becomes

13   a matter of timing, because, from a monitoring

14   perspective, I understand what you are saying.

15   But I would assume, correct me if I am

16   incorrect in my assumption, from March 8 on, I don't

17   think HPC made a lot of calls to the Help Desk. So

18   there was not going to be an opportunity to monitor

19   very much.

20   That again, to me, would point more

21   towards a close, unresolved, or close, unable to

22   determine. If there had been a fix made five months

23   ago and it was in a monitoring state and there had

24   been buckets of calls to the Help Desk made and there

25   was no reoccurrence, I think then HPC could

1 confidently conclude we had the opportunity to test

2 the effect of the process and we saw no reoccurrence

3 of the original problem. Thus, the monitoring didn't

4 appear to have the opportunity to monitor anything

5 because there were no more Help Desk calls or very

6 few Help Desk calls.

7   MS. ANDERSON: This is Denise. I would

8 like to step in.

9   Is this something you think you can

10 address in a couple statements or would you like to

11 take it away and come back with additional detail? I

12 am concerned we are getting bogged down on one item

13 here, that was probably beat to death in O&E

14 discussions, and we haven't even gotten to WorldCom's

15 questions on this section.

16   Would that be agreeable?

17   MR. MAY: We could do that. I believe,

18 though, and for the record HP concurs with KPMG's

19 sort of explanation. I don't believe we would state

20 anything materially different from what we have said

21 so far.

22   MS. ANDERSON: So that is the answer.

23 It's been asked; it's been answered. Can we move on?

24   MR. FINNEGAN: Sure.

25   MS. ANDERSON: I am just concerned,

1 because we are getting really bogged down in this one

2 area.

3   Next question.

4   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 25. Back to a

5 similar format of question which is the inclusion or

6 incorporation of HP experience around the specifics

7 of manual order errors.

8   Again, similar approach. KPMG Consulting

9 monitored HPC's observations and exceptions in an

10 attempt to highlight any findings and, therefore,

11 tailor our subsequent testing efforts to address

12 those findings. No AP exceptions were raised

13 concerning the manual order error process.

14   The next question, 26, same concept but

15 CLEC participation versus HPC. CLECs who responded

16 to us did not report any issues with Qwest's

17 following procedures for manual errors.

18   Again, I will put in the caveat that means

19 they likely didn't experience problems with the

20 output versus their expectations of those processes.

21   Question 27: "The Discrete Report states

22 that, 'CLECs confirmed adherence to established

23 callback intervals.' .

24   Other than adhering to callback intervals,

25 please summarize the CLECs responses on the more

1 general question of whether or not Qwest follows the

2 processes and procedures to check the status of a

3 manual order."

4   CLECs who responded to us indicated they

5 were satisfied with their ability to check order

6 status through IMA or by calling the call center.

7   Any other questions from AT&T or regarding

8 AT&T's set of questions?

9   MR. FINNEGAN: No.

10   MS. ANDERSON: Other related to 27-20.

11   MR. FINNEGAN: You mean the closed

12 unresolved one?

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: Moving on to WorldCom.

14   MR. DIXON: Just a minute.

15   MR. DELLA TORRE: We will return to

16 question 4 before moving to the WorldCom section.

17   So if everyone would note there is a box

18 highlighted within this diagram that if you started

19 at Step B 5, does the order contain an error, and

20 move down to an answer, yes, we have inserted in the

21 hand-out a series of steps that hopefully depicts the

22 process more clearly. That there is an evaluation,

23 does the error type require immediate rejection, yes

24 or no. If not, a non-fatal error notice is sent to

25 the CLEC. Does the CLEC return the SUP within a

1   four-hour period or does it become a fatal reject

2   that needs to be sent to the CLECs.

3   So I think there is a little more

4   distinction here between the non-fatals and fatals

5   with a note that non-fatals may become fatal if they

6   are not in fact responded to. And again, the

7   distinction can be made between error conditions

8   versus reject notices and error or rejections and

9   notices.

10   So there are responses sent back and forth

11   versus conditions encountered on the order and there

12   are relationships between the non-fatal notice that

13   may ultimately become a fatal or reject.

14   MR. FINNEGAN: Can you indulge me for the

15   moment?

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: Sure.

17   MR. FINNEGAN: On my version, this is the

18   April 1st version, would this be an add to Figure

19   12.8-2, the order processing overview?

20   MR. DELLA TORRE: This is not in your

21   report. In fact, we will put this entire -- this

22   process is described in language.

23   We will add this diagram that we have sent

24   out to everyone to the report, just to make it a

25   little bit more clear.

 1   MR. FINNEGAN: And the question was how

 2 would you revise 12.8-2.

 3   MR. WEEKS: The answer is, technical

 4 answer is we won't, we will produce it in the

 5 diagram, it describes the error process.

 6   MR. FINNEGAN: Okay. Would this be sort

 7 of a branch-off of anything --

 8   MR. WEEKS: It's actually, in the latest

 9 revision it's 12.8-3, not 12.8-2.

10   We will replace 12.8-3.

11   Are there questions about the error

12 process or were you just asking, the diagram as it

13 existed didn't appear to account for errors and

14 asking how those are handled?

15   MR. FINNEGAN: Well, it did --

16   MR. WEEKS: I am not sure what the

17 question you were asking was.

18   MR. FINNEGAN: The question was the

19 diagram as originally written accounted for fatal

20 rejects and fatal errors.

21   MR. WEEKS: As opposed to non-fatal.

22   MR. FINNEGAN: Right. The expectation was

23 there would be one chart that showed both fatal

24 errors and non-fatal errors.

25   MR. WEEKS: We understand.

1   MR. DELLA TORRE: Depending on how it

2   works in terms of putting it on paper, I have just

3   finally, a little bit more clear. If you will note,

4   B 4 and B 5 on the hand-out corresponds directly to

5   B 4 and B 5 in the figure, 12.8-3 in the report. So

6   there is an expansion if you will. There are new

7   steps included in the hand-out that aren't

8   represented in the current version of the report.

9   So if we are able to revise the report and

10   keep it clean and kind of on one page, we will

11   certainly do that.

12   If we need to add this as a dotted line,

13   we will. So whichever sort of logistically works

14   better.

15   MS. THIELEMANN: The report that went out

16   on the 13th has been clarified to explain that.

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: No explain the error

18   rejects and the like.

19   MR. CONNOLLY: I have one more, Joe. Tim

20   Connelly. In 12.8-8, the third paragraph reads,

21   Orders that have fallen out of the flow-through

22   system are automatically examined for errors by the

23   SOP.

24   MR. DELLA TORRE: That should be SDC.

25   That is a typo.

1   MR. CONNOLLY: Thank you.

2   MR. DELLA TORRE: WorldCom 1. Again, I

3   think everyone has these, so I will jump to the

4   questions rather than context of the questions.

5   "Please clarify, is it Qwest practice to

6   track LSR and ASR numbers plus PONs for each order.

7   If not, what would cause PONs to be excluded in Qwest

8   tracking mechanism?"

9   The response is they are tracked by LSR

10   and PON both on the order. Same with ASR, tracked by

11   ASR order and PON, both of which are on the order and

12   this information has been updated on the most recent

13   version of the report.

14   MS. OLIVER: Follow-up. Based on that

15   response then is it correct to assume that if the

16   CLEC were to make a call into the ISC and refer to

17   the order just by the PON number that Qwest would be

18   able to reference the order?

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: Absolutely.

20   Question 2: "What are the required

21   pre-screening edits performed by the 'Indexer'?"

22   The Indexer verifies that proper fields

23   are populated on the order and prepares the order for

24   typing by verifying data such as customer name,

25   company name, telephone number or fax number.

1   The Indexer is responsible for

2   prescreening edits and ensuring the proper fields are

3   populated on the fax LSRs. This information has been

4   updated in the most recent version of Discrete Report

5   12.8.

6   Question 3: "What is the criterion used

7   by the Indexer to determine, quote, 'timeliness'?"

8   We believe this is the result of a mistake

9   KPMG made in the -- in titling this report. It is

10   not a timeliness log sheet but rather it's called the

11   indexing daily log. We have since updated this in

12   the report.

13   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom. I

14   would like to back up for one second to question

15   number 2 for a follow-up.

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: Certainly.

17   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

18   Can you provide more clarification between

19   prescreening edits that the Indexer is performing and

20   the business rule edits or the BPL edits?

21   (Pause.)

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: These are for fax

23   orders, therefore there is no such thing as a BPL.

24   MS. OLIVER: But are the -- what is being

25   checked for the business rules the same, then?

1   MR. DELLA TORRE: It's comparable, yes.

2   MS. OLIVER: Okay.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 4: "What are

4   the required checks performed by the SDC?"

5   When the SDC extracts individual LSRs from

6   the IS server they check them for possible reject

7   reasons such as incomplete or inadequate field

8   entries as we were just discussing moments ago. This

9   has also been clarified in the latest version of the

10   report.

11   My thanks to MCI WorldCom for catching

12   some things that made the report a little more clear,

13   because that has been a steady response that I have

14   given, our report hopefully is a lot better at this

15   point.

16   Question 5: "What, if any, information is

17   automatically populated into the SOP such that the

18   SDC would not have to manually re-enter?"

19   Again, these are manual orders, and,

20   therefore, no information is automatically entered

21   into the SOP.

22   Question 6: "Does Qwest employ any audit

23   or control procedures to ensure manual processing is

24   validated prior to finalizing the steps to enter

25   order information into the SOP?"

1   The answer is yes. There are buddy checks

2   of the orders before issuance of a SOP.

3   Question 7: I will read all of the

4   context. "If the SOP detects any errors ... such as

5   an unrecognizable field entry or missing information,

6   the SOP alerts the SDC to the presence of the

7   errors." The question is, "How is the SDC alerted?"

8   The answer, they are alerted to errors

9   with an error code message from the SOP. This has

10   been updated in the most recent version.

11   Question 8: "Are there specific

12   documented monitoring procedures the SDC is required

13   to follow?"

14   KPMG Consulting is not aware of procedural

15   documentation for this process. Late orders,

16   however, would be reflected in the SDC's performance

17   reports including the In Today, Out Today and

18   four-hour --

19   Question 9: "What is the role of a

20   'coach'?"

21   Several different elements. It's the

22   overseeing group of SDCs to conduct performance

23   analysis, to provide assistance with order writing

24   and call handling, to provide data reporting as a

25   tool for management use.

1   We have updated the report to be more

2 explicit in identifying the roles and

3 responsibilities of a coach.

4   Question 10: "What audit and control

5 procedures does Qwest employ to minimize the level of

6 errors inherent with manual processing?"

7   I think we have gone through a few. There

8 is some, unrelated to this test evaluation, some

9 additional work being conducted as per the MTP change

10 request on the adequacy study, but in this particular

11 case, buddy checks are done before FOC issuance.

12   There is ticket sampling after FOCs to

13 determine where there are recurrent problem areas,

14 the result being the following, training, and there

15 is error reporting from the billing department and we

16 address this in 12.8-3.

17   Question 11: "Please clarify, when does

18 the BPL reject an order? Is it when a single error

19 is detected or when the entire LSR has been checked

20 and identifies all errors on an order?"

21   It's our understanding a BPL error will

22 indicate all errors that happen.

23   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

24   The response then, you are saying there

25 would be multiple, if there exists on the order

1 multiple rejects, there would be multiple error

2 codes.

3   MR. WEEKS: That is our understanding.

4   MS. OLIVER: Okay.

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 12: "Please

6 provide the reasons Qwest would prevent an order from

7 flowing to the SOP not including those designed as a

8 non-flow through order based upon business rules."

9   A pending order. Another SOP. A product

10 or activity type that is not flow-through eligible,

11 but is on an otherwise flow-through eligible order.

12   Invalid data included on an LSR. They

13 could be flow-through eligible in its original state.

14 But incorrect data that causes the drop.

15   Supplemental orders, invalid CSRs,

16 non-flow through features such as, say, circular

17 hunting or system errors and time-outs.

18   MR. FINNEGAN: I want to ask a follow-up.

19 This gets somewhat in Test 15. Would this also

20 include too many orders in the queue?

21   MR. DELLA TORRE: That is a fact that was

22 represented to us during the volume test.

23   MR. FINNEGAN: Do you consider that to be

24 a time-out?

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: I believe the strictest

1   definition of a time-out is a flow-through FOC

2   delivered in over two hundred seconds.

3   MR. FINNEGAN: That is a pre-order time

4   out.

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: That's right. Let me

6   follow up on that, John. In fact, please readdress

7   it in 15.

8   Question 13: "Please clarify what is

9   meant by, quote, 'manually issues a FOC to the

10   CLEC'".

11   SDC selects options in the IMH issue of

12   FOC. SDC issues the due date on the information and

13   submits to the CLEC in the same method the order was

14   received.

15   Question 14: "How does CRM alert the

16   SDC?"

17   If a downstream organization is unable to

18   process the order as written, and therefore requires

19   revision by the SDC, the SDC is alerted via CRM. The

20   question again is, "How does CRM alert the SDC?"

21   They alert -- the order is in an error status in the

22   queue. This indicates the SDC needs to pull the

23   order from IMA and fix as appropriate.

24   Again, this has been revised in the most

25   recent version of the report.

 1   MR. CONNOLLY: I have a question in

 2   follow-up.

 3   That implies that the downstream

 4   organizations finds something in the order that

 5   causes it to not be processable.

 6   Do those downstream organizations have

 7   direct access to CRMs to make that error condition

 8   known?

 9   MR. DELLA TORRE: Okay. It's my

10   understanding that the downstream organizations would

11   utilize IMA, which would then directly feed into CRM

12   so that the SDC would become aware of it through sort

13   of an IMA link.

14   MR. CONNOLLY: For example, the assignment

15   desk lets the order and doesn't have the required

16   pairs. It would interact with IMA to update the

17   order to say the facility is not available and that

18   would go into CRM.

19   MS. ANDERSON: I think Qwest wants to say

20   something. Is that okay?

21   MR. WEEKS: Sure.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: Absolutely.

23   MR. VIVEROS: I think we just need to

24   clarify. I think the question is a bit too broad

25   because it is going to vary depending on what

1   downstream organization you are talking about.

2   While some downstream organizations might

3   have access to IMA the most typical ordering error

4   conditions we are talking about are in the fax family

5   of systems, the service order flows into those

6   systems, those systems detect an error, it creates an

7   error condition on the service order. That error

8   condition on the service order is what feeds

9   information. It's commonly known as an ESOID. It

10   feeds information to CRM. The SDCs are monitoring

11   queues for all sorts of work including ESOIDs that

12   CRM has been made aware of from the downstream

13   system.

14   So the downstream organizations, the

15   actual humans, generally do not interact with CRM and

16   generally do not interact with IMA. Some do, some

17   have access to IMA like those processing directory

18   listings. But most error conditions as described

19   here would come through systems.

20   Someone in assignment would possibly

21   update the service order to reflect there was an

22   ESOID. That gets communicated backwards and is

23   registered in CRM and SDC in the service center can

24   see that they have more work to do.

25   MR. CONNOLLY: That happens in the service

1   order system? That ESOID?

2   MR. VIVEROS: Yes. It's actually done in

3   the facility assignment systems and there are

4   interactions between that and the SOP, between those

5   systems, the SOP and CRM.

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: And IMA.

7   MR. CONNOLLY: That was helpful. Thank

8   you.

9   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 15: "Did KPMG

10   witness the ISC Team Leaders and Coaches monitoring

11   work queues and resorts to ensure all orders are

12   being processed according to Qwest's established

13   SIGs?"

14   I would change "resorts" to "reports."

15   The answer is yes, we did.

16   Question 16: "Are there particular status

17   indicators that are populated when a change occurs or

18   is status information populated via comments?"

19   The answer is status is populated

20   automatically after steps in the auditing division

21   process are completed and our revised report will

22   reflect these changes.

23   MS. ANDERSON: I would like to maybe do a

24   time check right now. We are at the time that we had

25   scheduled for our morning break. I was wondering if

1   we could take five minutes, refill coffee, whatever,

2   then come back. We are behind and we may not get

3   through all of the questions.

4   Does anyone object to that? Let's take

5   five and come back.

6   (Recess.)

7   MS. OLIVER: Resume.

8   MS. ANDERSON: We are going to begin again

9   and go back on the transcription.

10   Joe, do you want to pick up where we left

11 off?

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: I am going to turn it

13 over to Geoff May for follow up.

14   MR. MAY: With regard to question number

15 24, we have caucused internally. Although we stand

16 by the actions we have taken to date, we are going to

17 provide a supplemental response to help clarify the

18 issues.

19   MS. ANDERSON: So that will be in our

20 follow-up questions just like we have from number 1?

21   MR. MAY: Correct.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 17 from MCI

23 WorldCom. "Please provide the list SDCs utilize to

24 determine non-fatal errors."

25   This was from Qwest's ordering web site,

1 Qwest,com. This is in our test report Section 2.1.4.

2 The non-fatal errors include those such as missing

3 contact information or mere match of a name or

4 address.

5   MR. WEEKS: There is a bullet list that

6 gives you the list of the non-fatals and fatals off

7 the web site.

8   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

9   So, does the SDC actually, you know,

10 envisioning this, sitting there with the list? How

11 do they work to make sure they cover the --

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: We didn't actually see

13 them use the list under the assumption that these

14 folks knew that, but we did not see them using the

15 list off of the web site. Additionally, there is an

16 error in the SOP to look for that if it's missed by

17 the SDC.

18   MS. OLIVER: Just for clarification. Your

19 statement that, "based on the assumption that they

20 knew that."

21   Do you mean based on the assumption that

22 the SDC had the knowledge-

23   MR. WEEKS: That they had been trained and

24 the training reinforces what kind of --

25   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

1   MR. DELLA TORRE: They do have reference

2   materials that we did see SDCs using. They identify

3   what the various codes are, how they are employed.

4   We did observe SDCs responding appropriately to error

5   conditions.

6   Question 18. "Are there procedures in

7   place in the event the SDC cannot get a hold of a

8   CLEC to obtain corrective information?"

9   The answer is yes. Non-fatal error

10   notices are sent to CLECs in every instance of a

11   non-fatal error. The CLEC may correct the order

12   using the same PON or contact the SDC. Phone calls

13   are not a mandatory process for addressing non-fatal

14   errors.

15   Our report has been revised in the most

16   recent version.

17   19 --

18   MS. OLIVER: Excuse me. Becky Oliver.

19   I haven't seen the report update you have

20   just referenced. But the report and where this

21   question came from was it seemed to imply that for

22   this error either the SDC would call the CLEC on the

23   phone and get the correction that way, or actually

24   issue the non-fatal error back.

25   So does the response now indicate that say

1   the phone call was made, CLEC was contacted and the

2   CLEC representative was able to provide the

3   correction on the phone, that the non-fatal error

4   would still be sent back and the CLEC would respond

5   with a SUP order.

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: Our understanding of the

7   process is it's the other way around, the notice

8   happens first. As a courtesy the SDC may use a phone

9   to follow up.

10   I believe we are at question 19: "Please

11   provide the list SDC's utilize to determine fatal

12   errors."

13   That is the same web site reference. In

14   our Section 2.1.4 we list examples of those fatal

15   error conditions or conditions that could cause fatal

16   errors.

17   Question 20: "Does the SDC identify all

18   known errors or is the order rejected upon the

19   identification of a single error?"

20   It's Qwest's policy to identify all errors

21   before rejecting the order.

22   Question 21: "What is meant by ASRs are

23   addressed on a case-by-case basis with the CLEC?"

24   The answer. ASRs are addressed

25   individually by notifying CLEC in two forms. We have

1   updated the most recent release of the draft report

2   to state that all errors on an ASR cause it to be

3   deemed invalid.

4   The SDC types a letter to the CLEC which

5   includes the PON and error detail in the text.

6   Letter requests the CLEC submit a supplementary order

7   to correct the error within 15 days and it's E-mailed

8   or faxed, depending upon the method in which the ASR

9   was submitted. The letter is also sent in the mail.

10   Invalid order information is entered into

11   an access database used by the SDC to track the due

12   date for the supplementary order. Notes regarding

13   the communication to the CLEC is also recorded. If

14   the CLEC fails to submit a supplemental within 15

15   days the order is manually canceled.

16   MS. OLIVER: Where is the e-mail address

17   that is used to return the letter if it is E-mailed

18   by, received from?

19   How does Qwest know which e-mail address

20   to use?

21   MR. DELLA TORRE: The CLEC's e-mail

22   address should be provided on the ASR that was

23   originally submitted by the CLEC.

24   MS. OLIVER: Do you happen to know which

25   field offhand?

1   MR. DELLA TORRE: I don't think we do.

2   Sorry.

3   MR. WEEKS: Chris, do you have that

4   memorized?

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: We could take that away

6   and see if we could find out on the ASR form.

7   MR. CONNOLLY: Joe, isn't it the case that

8   the e-mail that comes in would have the address of

9   the sender.

10   MR. WEEKS: Certainly would.

11   MR. DELLA TORRE: That would make sense.

12   We will determine if, in fact, there is sort of like

13   a design contact that is separate, a separate piece

14   of information.

15   MS. OLIVER: That's fine. No further

16   follow-up is necessary.

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: Thank you.

18   Question 22: "Does Qwest not have

19   documented procedures the SDC would follow for ASRs?

20   Yes.

21   MS. ANDERSON: I am not sure what "yes"

22   means?

23   MR. DELLA TORRE: That is why I am reading

24   the question a little more slowly.

25   MR. FINNEGAN: Like a Palm Beach ballot.

1   (Laughter.)

2   MR. DELLA TORRE: We do not have

3   documented procedures.

4   MR. WEEKS: We don't have the EMPs in

5   our -- I guess the question is are there M&Ps Qwest

6   has?

7   MS. OLIVER: Correct. The question is

8   getting at the statement about how invalid ASRs are

9   handled on a case-by-case basis. Our question is,

10   are their documented procedures Qwest is using.

11   MR. DELLA TORRE: The documentation answer

12   is no. Is there a process? The answer is yes. Did

13   we observe the process being adhered to? The answer

14   is yes.

15   Question 23: "Is the ASR rejected

16   manually or electronically?"

17   The answer is manually.

18   Question 24: "Does the SCIE designate a

19   single point of contact responsible for overseeing

20   the lifecycle of CLEC enquiries and escalations

21   through to resolution?"

22   The answer is no. They can be transferred

23   or referred to the next (inaudible) within the SDC

24   then responsibility for that inquiry and escalation

25   also transfers.

1   Question 25: "Are unresolved tickets

2   automatically escalated by Qwest or does the CLEC

3   have to request escalation?"

4   The answer is, escalation can happen by

5   either party, either at the request of the CLEC or if

6   the original SDC is unable to respond to the

7   question.

8   Question 26: "Did KPMG witness the steps

9   between opening and closing CSIE tickets?"

10   The answer is yes.

11   27: "Is there a designated party that

12   identifies resolved issues and closes the tickets in

13   the database?"

14   Similar to question 25, is the person

15   currently responsible and holding that spec ticket.

16   28: "Is closure of the ticket validated

17   by the CLEC?"

18   The answer is yes. We have additional

19   detail in 24.8-8.

20   29 --

21   MS. OLIVER: Question 28, follow-up.

22   Is the CLEC validation of ticket closure,

23   does that happen before the ticket is actually closed

24   or in conjunction or after?

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: The call is made just

1   prior to closure.

2   However, basically, if the phone isn't

3   answered by the CLEC, a message will be left in voice

4   mail and the ticket will be closed.

5   The CLEC then does have the liberty or

6   authority to call back and reopen or readdress that

7   issue if it wasn't resolved to their satisfaction.

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: My apologies.

9   Correction. A new ticket would be offered.

10   Question 29 and some context: "CLEC

11   requests for expedites or inquiries related to ASR

12   orders, are handled by the Monitoring Group in either

13   Des Moines, Iowa or Salt Lake City, Utah."

14   Question: "How are expedites or inquiries

15   tracked?"

16   Expedites are tracked in Lotus Notes and

17   EXACT. Non-order related inquiries are tracked using

18   call logs for center employs.

19   Let me say it again. The document is

20   called the call log for center employs. This has

21   been clarified in our most recent report, Section

22   2.1.5.

23   Question 30: "Please clarify, is HEET

24   updated by the Lotus Notes database? What are the

25   critical date-related information?"

1   Answer HEET is updated automatically by

2   Lotus Notes. Date0related information includes the

3   due date. We have updated this in 2.1.5.

4   Question 31: "Please verify, it is only

5   at the CLECs's request that ASR expedites and

6   inquiries can be escalated to senior ISC staff."

7   Similar to before, both CLECs and Qwest

8   SDCs can escalate with expedites and inquiries.

9   32: "Are there procedures in place in the

10   event a senior ISC staff cannot assist the CLEC?"

11   The answer is yes. There is additional

12   escalation of consultation with subject matter

13   experts until the issue is resolved.

14   Question 33: "Please verify, Qwest

15   internal process improvements do not formally follow

16   Qwest CMP."

17   The answer, the process improvement

18   tracking tool is separate from the change management

19   process. If a change is -- improvement is

20   implemented which doesn't impact CLECs it would not

21   necessarily be communicated to the CLECs.

22   Other questions on Test 12.8?

23   (Pause.)

24   MR. DELLA TORRE: I was looking for an

25   affirmative response.

1   Question 34: Did KPMG witness how Qwest

2   addresses feedback during quarterly executive

3   conference calls, in customer service meetings, or

4   through CLECs respective Qwest Service Managers?"

5   The answer is no.

6   Question 35: "What evidence was provided

7   to KPMG to make such a conclusion statement?"

8   The statement was capacity management is

9   addressed at both systems and staffing levels, for

10   context.

11   KPMG reviewed documentation specific to

12   the wholesale markets IWSC long-range forecast

13   report, reviewed ACD logs, IBA system track -- IBA,

14   interconnection business architecture systems

15   transaction forecasting tool, which forecasts

16   estimated product growth and resulting stresses on

17   systems that would be used to handle loads.

18   Additionally we conducted interviews with

19   Qwest IT representatives, and it was representative

20   that IT works with the wholesale finance group in

21   order to look at the IC's business as a whole, i.e.,

22   CLECs involved and types of orders they are placing,

23   the various forecasting information.

24   Algorithms are developed by product type

25   which can then be modified quarterly if required.

1   When new products are introduced they are

2   analyzed from a systems perspective based on the

3   anticipated load the order will place on the system.

4   Additionally we have conducted

5   observations of twice-daily force loading calls,

6   calls for adjustments to staffing levels across

7   virtual centers.

8   This is represented in Section 2.1.7.

9   Evaluation criteria 12.8-4 and 12.8-5.

10   Question 36: "Please provide a list of

11   the various capacity elements."

12   We have some that we will read off to you

13   but again those same criteria are referenced in 4

14   and 5.

15   Order and call volume, staff availability,

16   hold times, call handling times, time to issue FOCs,

17   number of orders in queue.

18   Question 37: "Does Qwest define when

19   periodic reviews and adjustments will occur?"

20   The answers are that there is the

21   twice-daily force loading calls, quarterly review of

22   volume forecasts and monthly review of work schedules

23   and head count. We note this in 2.1.7.

24   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

25   So those periodic reviews at the times you

1   just stated, do adjustments then follow those

2   reviews?

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes.

4   Question 38: "Did KPMG Consulting witness

5   what impact these meetings had on Qwest performance?"

6   The answer is yes.

7   Question 39: I will read the context.

8   "Productivity for individual SDCs, products, and ISCs

9   is tracked on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis.

10   Similarly, SDC quality is observed, recorded and

11   tracked by supervisors on a regular basis using

12   measures that include order accuracy and call

13   handling performance. These measures serve as the

14   basis for performance evaluations, feedback, and

15   follow-up training.

16   Please verify KPMG witnessed all these

17   activities."

18   The answer is yes, KPMG witnessed all the

19   above listed activities.

20   Okay.

21   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

22   I would like you to back up to question

23   37.

24   MR. DELLA TORRE: Sure.

25   MS. OLIVER: I have additional follow-up.

1   It was stated the adjustments followed these periodic

2   reviews and I am having a hard time understanding

3   how. It seems a lot to make adjustments following

4   meetings that are held, you said there are meetings

5   held twice a day.

6   How are adjustments made that quickly with

7   the resources that are available?

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: In fact, we were

9   fortunate enough to have a snow storm power outage in

10   Denver when we were in one of these centers. And we

11   observed a shift in work load from one center to

12   another center at the time we were actually there due

13   to an occurrence that couldn't have been anticipated

14   but that had clearly a dramatic effect on capacity.

15   So we did see that shift happen.

16   MS. OLIVER: All right.

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 40: "Please

18   verify, KPMG witnessed the ISC management and

19   supervisory personnel utilized these measurement

20   tools as the basis for SDC evaluation, capacity

21   management, executive reports, and Public Service

22   Performance Results Reports that correspond to PIDs."

23   KPMG witnessed the above being utilized

24   for SDC evaluation, capacity management and executive

25   reports. However, we did not witness these reports

1 being utilized to directly roll up to performance

2 results reported in corresponding PIDs.

3   I refer you to Liberty Consulting's report

4 for possible additional information on PID reporting.

5   Question 41: "Did KPMG determine that the

6 documented procedures are sufficient to handle and

7 process CLEC orders, (i.e. consistently and

8 accurately applying business rule edits and returning

9 valid responses)?"

10   The answer is yes.

11   42: "How does Qwest incorporate training

12 requirements into its processes and procedures for

13 future increases in order capacity?

14   Both SDCs and (inaudible) are

15 cross-trained to accommodate shifting of work on a

16 short-term basis.

17   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

18   So that response would assume the shift in

19 work would be acceptable if work capacity in another

20 region decreased?

21   MR. WEEKS: Or there was excess capacity.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: I believe what we have

23 seen and are attesting to is shifts by location and

24 also level.

25   MS. OLIVER: This question is getting at

1   when there is an increase in work capacity and having

2   trained reps available to increase your staffing. I

3   am not sure how the response of how these reps

4   cross-train and being able to shift addresses the

5   overall increase in what needs to be supported.

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: Well, if the statement

7   is that there is a simultaneous increase in order

8   load short-term in all centers at the same time then

9   we are not able to attest to their capacity to handle

10 that. If the load is in different centers not all

11 concurrently, then we can attest to the fact that

12 Qwest employs shifting of resources.

13   But if it was an immediate and short-term

14 escalation in every center, then we did not see it.

15   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: 43: "Has KPMG performed

17 an evaluation to determine accuracy and adequacy of

18 the Qwest web site listed above?"

19   (Pause.)

20   MR. DELLA TORRE: We did evaluate the web

21 site for consistency and accuracy across the

22 different documentation and practices and procedures

23 employed in the particular centers. But I'd like to

24 ask, is the question asking whether or not we

25 assessed this web site for its comprehensiveness?

1   Maybe you could clarify the question.

2   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

3   The question is trying to understand if

4   KPMG did an evaluation to determine if the web site,

5   the information on the web site was accurate and

6   comprehensive in that it was adequate to meet the

7   needs of the CLECs looking at that information, did

8   it provide the type of information the CLEC would

9   need?

10   (Pause.)

11   MR. DELLA TORRE: We did not do a

12   comprehensive, stand-alone evaluation of the web

13   site, the information on the web site.

14   If and when we were presented with

15   information regarding how SDCs do their business,

16   what information is presented, and there were

17   references made to the web site, we then went to

18   determine that the information that was being

19   referenced was accurate, was complete, was adequate.

20   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

21   MR. DELLA TORRE: Let's try this again.

22   Other questions on Test 12.8?

23   Okay. I think we should probably just

24   move right along after we shuffle some books.

25   MS. ANDERSON: Yes. You just need to

1   change teams.

2   We are going to be moving right on to Test

3   15. KPMG will be changing some support team members.

4   We are going to change the order of the

5   questions addressed. We will be dealing with

6   WorldCom questions first, just to prove that we at

7   the ROC try to ensure non-discriminatory access to

8   answers.

9   MR. DIXON: Test 15 questions?

10   MS. ANDERSON: Right and you guys are

11   getting your questions answered first.

12   MR. DIXON: Right. I just wanted to make

13   sure we were on the same page.

14   MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

15   (Pause.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
1              Test 15 - POP Volume Performance Test
2              MS. ANDERSON:  We will move to Test 15,
3     volume testing.  We will be addressing WorldCom
4     questions first.  I think we have made our swaps
5     here.  A technical term.
6              MR. WEEKS:  Okay.
7              MS. ANDERSON:  Okay, Joe and Mike.
8              MR. WEEKS:  Test T is the POP Pre-order
9     Provisions Volume Performance Test.  The questions
10    that were prepared were based upon the report dated
11    March 19th.  We have subsequently, on April 11th,
12    produced a different report, an additional or revised
13    report.
14             So some of the questions may be a little
15    out of sync with what is sitting out there right now,
16    but we will try to answer them as best we can.
17             For those of you who like to keep score,
18    32 satisfies two of the particular evaluation
19    criteria were diagnostic in nature, so they are not a
20    pass or fail.
21             So that is where we are on that.  We will
22    start with WorldCom questions.
23             MR. DELLA TORRE:  All right.  WorldCom
24    question number 1:  "Please verify, KPMG did not
25    perform any scalability analysis during this test."
```

1   That is a correct statement.

2   Question 2: "Please verify, LSOG 5

3   business rules applied to GUI and EDI volume

4   testing."

5   That is correct. We have updated this in

6   our revised report.

7   Question 3: "What projected transaction

8   volume was determined by analyzing historical CLEC

9   ordering behavior, CLEC and Qwest forecasts?"

10   I will read three numbers off to you. The

11 March, 02 projected volumes for LSRs: 171,000. For

12 DSRs, 32,400 for a total of 203,400.

13   Question 4: "Please verify, during POP

14 volume performance test that stand alone pre-order

15 queries were executed and resulting information was

16 utilized to populate order transactions."

17   Just as a clarification, the concept of

18 stand alone pre-orders is that they are not then

19 integrated with the orders.

20   For our volume test we used stand alone

21 pre-orders as independent acts.

22   5: "How did KPMG preserve blindness not

23 only during he preparation stages but during

24 execution of testing on each of these particular

25 days?"

1   Referencing the normal P and (inaudible).

2   The blindness during preparation stages,

3   there was no specific identification of test accounts

4   and scenario types and transaction types that we

5   would run that would distinguish them from volume and

6   function.

7   In terms of execution, Qwest was not

8   notified of the excuse dates or times from the normal

9   peak.

10   MS. OLIVER: So it would be correct to say

11   there was no difference between the test bed accounts

12   used for POP volume performance tests and test bed

13   accounts used for the functionality testing?

14   MR. WEEKS: In terms of the type of

15   accounts, if you want to describe the business

16   characteristics of the accounts, then they were

17   similar.

18   If you want to talk about the specific

19   details of the accounts, yes, there were separate

20   accounts provisioned with the different company code

21   than the company code used for feature function test.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: But the original state

23   of the orders which is how we request the test bed,

24   these provide us with a single line residential

25   account that has already been monitored into a CLEC.

 1   That request was exactly the same, so there would

 2   have been no distinguishing the two.

 3   Question 6: "What is the percentage break

 4   out between orders designed to FOC and orders

 5   designed to error?" Then the follow-on is, "Was an

 6   activity type (i.e., new) used for a single account

 7   multiple times?"

 8   Let me answer before we go on. Percentage

 9   breakout. For the normal day, normal and peak

10   combined, which is typically how we provide the

11   results was 2.24 percent of the orders were designed

12   to receive an error.

13   The answer is yes. That a particular

14   activity type was used on a single count multiple

15   times.

16   MR. CONNOLLY: The 2.24 percent of the

17   intentionally induced error was unique to orders?

18   Can you list the percentage on pre-orders as well?

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: We do not have a

20   pre-order error number. We did not submit

21   intentional errors on pre-orders.

22   MR. CONNOLLY: Thank you.

23   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 7: For

24   context, "Disconnects were used as a proxy for

25   Directory Service Request (DSR) orders." The

1   question is or request is,"Please clarify this

2   footnote."

3   And our response, directory service

4   requests are manual transactions, and since this is a

5   manual order, it was determined that a disconnect

6   order, because of the number of fields that must be

7   populated on it, could serve as a proxy for the DSR.

8   This approach was approved by the TET.

9   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver with WorldCom.

10   I need to back up to question 6, please.

11   The response was, the single activity type

12   was used multiple times on a single account.

13   MR. WEEKS: Yes.

14   MS. OLIVER: How is that facilitated by

15   KPMG? I am assuming that that response means that

16   for account A I had --

17   MR. WEEKS: The same order process --

18   MS. OLIVER: -- new loop, new loop, new

19   loop, for example?

20   MR. DELLA TORRE: That's right.

21   MS. OLIVER: So wouldn't that -- second

22   follow-up to question 6, I didn't hear the response.

23   What error condition --

24   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes. Absolutely, my

25   apologies. We had invalid desired due dates, invalid

1   picks and invalid help picks.

2   MS. OLIVER: Is that in the report?

3   MR. WEEKS: It's in the revised report.

4   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes, revised version.

5   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: You are welcome.

7   Question 8: "Please clarify how was Qwest

8   directed to establish test bed accounts for the

9   volume test?"

10   I believe we did you discussed that a

11 moment ago.

12   "What, if any, information was provided by

13 KPMG for Qwest to establish these accounts?"

14   "What information was provided back to

15 KPMG upon completion of the test bed set up?"

16   And those would be CSRs for those accounts

17 for facilities inventory information, for our ability

18 to do new transactions. (Inaudible).

19   Question 9: "Did Qwest systems properly

20 handle the planned erred transactions under increased

21 volume conditions?"

22   The answer is yes. Qwest systems handled

23 the erred transactions as expected.

24   Follow-up question: "Did KPMG Consulting

25 induce non-fatal and fatal error conditions.

1   The answer is yes, that we did induce

2   them, but please keep in mind our discussion before

3   about non-fatals versus fatals and in this case

4   non-fatals would be processed manually. And by test

5   design manual orders were not responded to.

6   Question 10: "When and how were the

7   results of the first stress test provided to Qwest?

8   Were these results provided to the ROC TAG? Did

9   Qwest make any changes between the first stress test

10   and additional diagnostic stress volume test?"

11   Complete results for volume testing were

12   first produced in the March 19, 2002 report

13   distributed to the ROC TAG.

14   However, I believe the first observation

15   was raised on December 12 of 2001 indicating we had

16   only received approximately 42 percent of the LSRs

17   that we expected to receive, therefore there was a

18   public informal release of information on the volume

19   test performance, but it was not, in fact, the

20   complete results. It was just an indication of the

21   problems we had found.

22   And per Qwest Formal Response to 12-18,

23   Qwest did make changes and fixes, we did not perform

24   a root cause analysis. However we did around the

25   second iteration of the stress test.

 1   11: "How is Qwest able to disable the

 2   pending order restriction on the volume transactions

 3   only and not on other production orders?"

 4   Now, I will -- the way that I think this

 5   was done was through a customer code difference that

 6   we used in volume versus feature function. But what

 7   the actual specific changes that were made by Qwest

 8   that made that happen, I do not know and we did not

 9   verify.

10   Question 12: "Were the error conditions

11   imposed on orders that were designed to flow

12   through?"

13   The answer is yes.

14   13: "Why would these flawed orders not

15   receive reject/error responses from Qwest?"

16   Again, these particular orders were not

17   expected to flow through, therefore were dropped from

18   manual handling and, by test design, would not be

19   responded to.

20   Question 14 is directed to HP.

21   MR. MAY: In the interested of efficiency

22   we would like to defer this question and response to

23   when we address AT&T questions 7 and 8 because HP's

24   response to these questions covers this ground in a

25   bit more. HP would be happy to address any remaining

1   WorldCom concerns or follow-up questions after those

2   responses.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 15: KPMG makes

4   reference to several other data sources for

5   constructing, executing, evaluating the volume test

6   and the request is, "Please elaborate, how were these

7   additional pieces of information used by KPMG in

8   performing the POP volume test?"

9   We used forecast and historical volume

10   data to determine both the number and the type of

11   transactions that would be submitted over the normal

12   volume, normal peak and stress volume.

13   Question 16. Context. "KPMG Consulting

14   examined a sample of 500 pre-order responses for

15   completeness." Question: "How was this sample

16   derived?

17   Did the sample include multiple

18   occurrences of the same pre-order responses for an

19   individual account?"

20   KPMG Consulting used a repetitive example

21   and multiple occurrences of the same pre-order

22   responses for an individual account or review.

23   By representative sample, we selected

24   across a variety of types, across the hours of the

25   day, in order to sample across the different

1   possibilities.

2   MS. OLIVER: I am not sure I followed

3   that. Representative sample. So you looked at

4   production activity, or representative sample of --

5   MR. WEEKS: Of the responses we received.

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: Of the responses we

7   received to the pre-order queries we submitted. We

8   submitted across several types of pre-orders,

9   throughout the course of the day we submitted

10 queries, we received responses to those.

11   Once all of those responses were received

12 we selected by type and by time across the day and

13 across the types.

14   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

15   MR. DELLA TORRE: Sure.

16   Question 17: Did KPMG perform any root

17 cause analysis regarding the issue of the STATE

18 field?

19   In fact, we did do some additional

20 analysis on this that was the result of comments made

21 to our first issuance of the report. KPMG Consulting

22 misinterpreted the conditions surrounding the STATE

23 field and, in fact, after we clarified our

24 understandings of the business rules, we determined

25 that Qwest systems did in fact provide a complete

1   CSRQ pre-order responses via both EDI and GUI. That

2   will be reflected in the report.

3   Question 18: "How was this sample

4   derived? Did the sample include multiple occurrences

5   of the same pre-order response for an individual

6   account?"

7   And essentially the same answer.

8   MS. OLIVER: Okay.

9   MR. DELLA TORRE: As 16.

10   Question 19: "Criterion 15-2-1 - 'Of 5940

11   LSRs submitted, 100 percent received FAs.' Please

12   validate, these were only the orders designed to

13   flow-through?"

14   That is not correct. Functional

15   acknowledgments were received for both flow and

16   non-flow orders. The flow-through determination

17   happens after the functional acknowledgment is

18   generated.

19   Question 20 --

20   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom. I

21   need to ask a clarification on that.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: Certainly.

23   MS. OLIVER: Non-flow through, I guess I

24   am thinking of performance volume tests, all the

25   orders were designed to flow through.

1   MR. DELLA TORRE: That is not correct.

2   MR. WEEKS: We stick in some records.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: We have, there were

4   orders that were sent in intentionally to drop.

5   MS. OLIVER: Because of an error

6   condition.

7   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

8   MS. ANDERSON: Or designed to flow

9   through.

10   MS. OLIVER: Okay.

11   MR. DELLA TORRE: They are sent as sort of

12   a control group, if you will.

13   MR. WEEKS: Again, they are designed not

14   to flow through. Which means they are electronically

15   submitted, there is nothing wrong with the order but

16   by its definition, it's the type of product that

17   doesn't flow through all the way to the service order

18   processor without intervention. It's designed to

19   drop for manual handling. So there were included in

20   some of the orders we sent planned non-flow throughs

21   that got handled manually.

22   All orders received through the EEI

23   interface get 997s because it's a protocol level

24   functional acknowledgment that the message had been

25   received and it's a valid protocol, valid type

1   message. That is what an FA is.

2   MR. DELLA TORRE: At the highest level

3   there would be two reasons for an order to be

4   non-flow through. One is flow through order that

5   dropped because of an error, as you indicated. And

6   the second is one intentionally known up front as

7   Mike said.

8   MR. FINNEGAN: Wouldn't there be a third

9   possibility.

10   MR. WEEKS: Yes.

11   MR. FINNEGAN: Too many orders in the

12   queue.

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: There would, for sure.

14   Question 20: "'Of 5467 LSRs submitted for

15   which a FOC was expected, 95.352 percent received a

16   FOC.' Did KPMG perform any analysis on the

17   percentage of orders that did not receive a FOC?"

18   The answer is yes and several of the

19   underlying reasons for which a FOC was not received

20   would include that the interface was not properly

21   returning the CSR, that the CFA was undetermined,

22   that the LSR timed out, that the order was unable to

23   retrieve the SBN. That there was a SOP error or CLEC

24   error on the orders.

25   MR. FINNEGAN: Just to understand, there

1   was an accounting of all of the ones that didn't go

2   back? So if there were a case of it got lost, lost

3   order situation, you didn't see any completely lost

4   orders?

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes.

6   MR. WEEKS: That's correct.

7   MS. ANDERSON: Could I interrupt just a

8   moment. This is Denise. Would folks on the bridge

9   please be sure their mute buttons are on? We have a

10 lot of staticky paper shuffling. Thank you.

11   Okay.

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 21: "Qwest's

13 response to Exceptions [3084 & 3092] Stated that

14 during the reported times, Qwest experienced a system

15 problem. Did Qwest implement any fix upon

16 identification of the system problem?"

17   Just representing Qwest's response here,

18 formal response, Qwest noted a system event that

19 occurred during normal tests on 11-1 that lasted

20 approximately 48 minutes. The response did not

21 detail any fix that may have been implemented.

22   MR. FINNEGAN: There is a later evaluation

23 criteria where KPMG reports 100 percent system

24 availability for the ordering interface.

25   That seems inconsistent with those

1   exceptions. How could you, in the exceptions,

2   identify and note an outage of a server, but then in

3   the evaluation criteria report a hundred percent

4   systems availability?

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: The systems availability

6   is a measure of the front end. Hence you will note

7   systems availability and functional acknowledgments

8   both of much higher numbers than the back end systems

9   that they may link to.

10   As I noted before, some of the reasons a

11   FOC might not be returned, well in those conditions

12   those FOCs weren't returned, but we did receive

13   functional acknowledgments because the interface was

14   available. That doesn't necessarily mean all the

15   back end systems were behaving appropriately or are

16   up or available.

17   MR. FINNEGAN: If I recall the definition

18   of a system outage in the PID it's a serious loss of

19   functionality.

20   MR. WEEKS: Again, I will state that the

21   purpose of the volume test has always been the

22   ability of the interface that is unique to the

23   wholesale community to be available and accept

24   orders, not for the entire complex that processes all

25   orders. It's a test of the ability of that front end

1   system to absorb large volumes of orders over a short

2   period of time and it's never been intended, nor in

3   the other jurisdictions either, intended to guarantee

4   that all the systems downstream from the order

5   interface systems were available and operating

6   properly.

7   MR. DELLA TORRE: If I may to follow on,

8   sorry to interrupt there, during that 48-minute

9   outage period we were receiving other -- some of the

10   order types and others we were receiving late. So it

11   was not an across-the-board shutdown.

12   MR. FINNEGAN: What I was going to say,

13   with even Mike's definition, you are just at some

14   bounds on the interface you are evaluating, wouldn't

15   the FOC problem be in bounds in that evaluation as to

16   the system's ability to accept and process the

17   orders?

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: That is why we issued

19   the exceptions on missing and late FOCs. Your

20   question was originally on system availability and

21   contradiction. We are in fact stating yes, you are

22   correct. We did note there was a problem returning

23   FOCs, but no, you are not correct that that

24   necessarily implies systems availability is down.

25   MR. WEEKS: So as long as I can still

1   place orders and as long as I am still receiving

2   responses, I don't have -- the standard isn't in

3   perfection. I don't have to have --

4   MR. FINNEGAN: If you are sending orders,

5   not receiving FOCs, you don't consider that a serious

6   loss of functional.

7   MR. WEEKS: It is defined for the PID, but

8   not for the purposes of volume tests.

9   MR. FINNEGAN: Even with the limited

10 definition, wouldn't that be systems unavailable if

11 you are not receiving FOCs?

12   MR. WEEKS: You could not get FOCs for a

13 variety of reasons. As long as you are still getting

14 your messages in or getting your LSRs in and they are

15 being acknowledged and being processed, then the fact

16 there is some downstream dysfunctionality doesn't

17 mean the wholesale interfaces are down because there

18 is a common piece between wholesale and retail. That

19 is kind of the boundary you were talking about

20 earlier.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: I understand there are

22 reasons other than systems outage, but in this

23 particular response Qwest said the reason they didn't

24 get the FOCs was the system was down.

25   MR. WEEKS: Part of the system, but not

1   the wholesale system.

2   MR. FINNEGAN: Part of the system.

3   MR. WEEKS: But the wholesale system which

4   is all the volume test is designed to evaluate.

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: If we said this wrong we

6   will fix it, but it wasn't a systems outage noted by

7   Qwest. It was a systems event. The system we saw

8   was not missing responses, but rather we saw

9   duplicate responses, therefore clearly the system was

10   available and was in fact too available. We received

11   multiple responses back including error conditions

12   because the orders appeared to be requeued and

13   processed twice. So this was a systems event noted,

14   not a systems outage. So in terms of impact on

15   systems availability, there is none.

16   MR. FINNEGAN: There was also reference to

17   a server outage, server outage causing the system

18   event. I guess the bottom line is KPMG viewed that

19   as system was available.

20   MR. WEEKS: System was behaving, it was

21   interacting, communicating and processing and doing

22   some things you would expect it to do. The fact it

23   didn't do them all perfectly doesn't mean it wasn't

24   available.

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: Additionally, in terms

1   of systems availability in those where we didn't

2   receive a FOC because there was a systems condition,

3   those orders dropped from manual handling and we

4   wouldn't have received it, because manual and

5   processed order are not handled during the volume

6   test.

7   So while we may have expected under normal

8   conditions to receive a manually processed FOC or

9   manually processed error, we did not receive either

10   because of the test design.

11   So when these FOCs in fact could not flow

12   through they dropped from manual handling and then

13   were essentially dead in terms of the volume test.

14   Again, no impact or reference can be drawn

15   to systems availability because, in fact, if you had

16   submitted an order during that same period, it may

17   not have flown through, but it would have been

18   processed and the system was available to you

19   potentially.

20   MR. FINNEGAN: So I understand the only

21   way KPMG would have considered the system unavailable

22   was one, if the system wouldn't accept the order, or

23   two, if there was no functional acknowledgment

24   received?

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

1   MR. WEEKS: Because everything, every

2   other interaction you have isn't being generated by

3   the wholesaler, it's being generated by the back end

4   common retail wholesale systems.

5   MR. FINNEGAN: Well, I won't get into the

6   advocacy.

7   MS. ANDERSON: We may be in a

8   philosophical difference here.

9   MR. WEEKS: That is an explanation of how

10   we have conducted all the volume tests in all the

11   jurisdictions. It is what it is. If that is not

12   desirable or acceptable, do your advocacy in the

13   right places.

14   MR. DELLA TORRE: Back to the questions.

15   Question 22 from WorldCom.

16   A sample, sampling question, which we

17   discussed earlier, the same method was used and

18   multiple occurrences also occurred.

19   Question 23: "Did KPMG perform an

20   evaluation of the accuracy of the due date provided

21   on the FOC?"

22   The answer is yes. The due dates did in

23   fact conform or match the due date return by Qwest.

24   Question 24: "Did KPMG find that the

25   missing DSGCON field in the FOC response had no

1   impact to Qwest downstream processing and completion

2   of the order?"

3   In fact that is not an evaluation we make

4   here. These orders did not go through to completion.

5   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom. The

6   report includes the statements that the missing

7   value, in KPMG's opinion, would not impede the CLEC

8   business operations, but it seems to imply that you

9   were looking at it a step beyond. That is why the

10 question was asked, well, does that impact the

11 placeability.

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: The reason the comment

13 was thrown in is because it's a required field, in

14 terms of evaluating the volume test. It's an

15 assessment of the firm order confirmation in the

16 various fields, fields, forms and values that are

17 populated and whether they are populated

18 appropriately.

19   So that is sort of the boundaries of the

20 volume test evaluation.

21   While we made the comment that since it

22 was a required field it would originally be provided

23 by the CLEC. If it were not returned, the CLEC would

24 already have that evaluation.

25   If you go beyond that into the downstream,

1   that was not part of the evaluation.

2   Question 25: "What is the threshold IMA

3   utilizes to determine LSRs are not being processed in

4   a timely fashion?"

5   We did not identify and do not know what

6   that threshold is.

7   Question 26: "When flagged for manual

8   attention, what audit and control procedures are

9   employed by Qwest to ensure these orders are reviewed

10   in a timely fashion?"

11   That also is not in the scope of the

12   volume test.

13   Other follow-up questions to the WorldCom

14   section?

15   Move on to AT&T.

16   Question 1: "Confirm that the 'Local

17   Service Ordering Guidelines (LSOG) 5 Business Rules,'

18   that were the basis for pre-order and order

19   transactions, are those business rules published by

20   Qwest and not ATIS?"

21   That is correct.

22   We will defer questions 2 and 3 to HPC.

23   MR. MAY: AT&T question number 2:

24   "Identify the source of the Interactive Agent used to

25   conduct Test 15."

1   The interactive agent used by HPC in Test

2   15 was developed internally by HPC and was based on

3   the telecommunications industry form Interactive

4   Agent Standard, which is TCIF-98-006,issue 2.

5   Prior to March 11, 2002 the HPC

6   Interactive Agent was TCIF, issue 2. On March 11,

7   2002 the HPC IA was upgraded and was based on TCIF,

8   issue 2, revision 1.

9   MR. FINNEGAN: Follow-up. The tests

10   appear to be done in the November time frame?

11   MR. MAY: January.

12   MR. FINNEGAN: January.

13   MR. MAY: Yes.

14   MR. FINNEGAN: Some of those references

15   were additional information you are saying after

16   March 11th, 2002?

17   MR. MAY: Yes.

18   MR. FINNEGAN: Okay.

19   MR. MAY: AT&T 3: "Confirm the

20   interactive agent used to conduct Test 15 is the same

21   as the system used for conducting the functionality

22   testing. If different Interactive Agents were used,

23   please describe both and provide an explanation for

24   the reasons for using different Interactive Agents."

25   HPC's internally developed Interactive

1   Agent was used throughout the Test 15 POP volume

2   testing process. With regard to Test 12, HPC used

3   the Templar Interactive Agent from April 12th, 2001,

4   to August 22nd, 2001.

5   HPC then migrated from Templar to the HPC

6   Interactive Agent as a part of HPC's internal

7   software development process.

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 4: "What is

9   the percentage of intentional error conditions

10   inserted into the test volume test ordering volume?"

11   This is a restate.

12   Question 5: "How were the intentional

13   error conditions spread throughout the 13-state base

14   of order activity?"

15   There were 12 states used for these

16   errors. The state that was not was Oregon.

17   MR. CONNOLLY: That was the induced

18   errors.

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: That's correct.

20   MR. CONNOLLY: What's the percentage of

21   induced non-flow through conditions?

22   MR. WEEKS: We don't know. We will have

23   to get back to you.

24   MR. CONNOLLY: Thanks.

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 6: "What was

1   the incidence of non-flow through orders that were

2   not intentionally submitted errors?"

3   The number is zero. Non-flow through -- I

4   am sorry. That were not intentionally submitted I

5   believe is how that is supposed to read.

6   MR. WEEKS: What was meant by the

7   question?

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: What was the incidence

9   of non-flow through orders that were not

10 intentionally submitted, correct? So you are

11 asking --

12   MR. WEEKS: Let him ask his question.

13   (Pause.)

14   MR. CONNOLLY: What we are looking for is

15 the number of orders that should have flowed through

16 but have not.

17   MR. WEEKS: You are looking for the

18 percentage or number of flow-through orders that did

19 not in fact flow through for one reason or another

20 and that was a surprise to us?

21   MR. CONNOLLY: Right.

22   MR. FINNEGAN: Was that --

23   MR. CONNOLLY: We hire you for order

24 writing skills?

25   MR. WEEKS: If I could explain a little

1   about how we do this, we create seed orders ahead of

2   time that we have run through the loop and know they

3   are good orders, the LSRs are good and so on.

4   Speaking about planned non-good ones.

5   So it would only be unusual circumstance

6   on the Qwest side of the fence that would cause

7   planned good ones to fall out as opposed to a planned

8   error.

9   MR. FINNEGAN: Later in the report you get

10   into some of the math where I think you were

11   expecting 95 percent of orders, valid orders to

12   receive a valid FOC.

13   MR. WEEKS: That is an evaluation

14   criteria.

15   MR. FINNEGAN: But is that the equivalent

16   of orders you expected to flow through that didn't,

17   if it didn't flow through, it wouldn't have received

18   a FOC.

19   MR. WEEKS: No, I think that is how well

20   Qwest performed.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: That I understand, but it

22   was 95.23 percent, if I remember. Something less

23   than a hundred. There was some percentage of orders

24   where you expected a FOC, but didn't get a FOC back.

25   Was that because you had expected it to flow through

1   but it did not or does it include some of the ones

2   you didn't expect to flow through and expected to

3   error out.

4   MR. DELLA TORRE: I think the information

5   we presented a moment ago was incorrect. We thought

6   we were talking about error conditions, but in fact

7   if you are talking the entire population of the

8   volume test, and we started out with expectations of

9   what would flow and what would not flow, those

10 expectations were not a hundred percent met, until

11 after the fact when we then looked at the orders

12 again and recognized there was this error on this

13 case and this error on that case. And, therefore,

14 the order behaved as it should have behaved. Our

15 original expectations were incorrect.

16   That is an important subtlety and

17 distinction that when we started, I will go through

18 this with an example to make it extremely clear, when

19 we started we had ten orders, we expected 1 through 7

20 to flow through and 8 through 10 to drop. They

21 behaved as they behaved.

22   When they didn't behave as we expected, we

23 examined them further and, in fact, found some

24 conditions where when they didn't behave as we

25 expected, they did behave as they should have,

1   because there were errors on the orders we missed.

2   Or there were conditions on the orders that caused

3   them to behave differently from what we originally

4   expected. So the behavior was appropriate. Our

5   expectation originally was incorrect.

6   MR. FINNEGAN: Did you account for that in

7   your statistics? If you thought something was

8   supposed to flow through and made a mistake, there

9   was an error on it and it --

10   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes, we did.

11   MR. WEEKS: If it got counted as a

12   non-flow through error, it was our fault.

13   MR. FINNEGAN: Yes. Did you exclude that

14   from --

15   MR. DELLA TORRE: No, we did not. We

16   evaluated the behavior, not our ability to determine

17   expectation.

18   MR. FINNEGAN: Which I think would be the

19   reasonable thing to do. But consistent with that, I

20   would exclude it from your expectation of serving a

21   FOC.

22   MR. WEEKS: That is true, because anything

23   that fell out would not have received a FOC, by

24   definition.

25   MR. FINNEGAN: Right. If you are

1   measuring Qwest's performance in processing orders

2   that should flow through --

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Right.

4   MR. FINNEGAN: -- it's not a

5   hundred percent. If they are falling out because you

6   did something wrong --

7   MR. WEEKS: There is a difference between

8   achieved flow-through and design flow-through, the

9   point you are trying to make. We, like other CLECs,

10   made mistakes. So our achieved flow-through was less

11   than a hundred percent because we blew the order. We

12   didn't count that against Qwest.

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: The expected flow

14   through number dropped by that number of orders that

15   we made mistakes on.

16   MR. FINNEGAN: Okay. So it's really more

17   a measure of the achieved flow through and that

18   achieved flow through accounted for errors

19   unintentionally introduced by KPMG?

20   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: Or HP.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

23   MR. WEEKS: In other words, we put things

24   into piles that said did the system behave the way it

25   was supposed to behave, it goes over there. Did it

1   behave in a way it was not supposed to, we put them

2   over here.

3   The only thing then that could have

4   behaved, then, the way it was supposed to that was

5   flow through for the flow through percentages I think

6   you are talking about would be that subset of design

7   flow throughs that actually did flow through.

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: That's right.

9   MR. FINNEGAN: Is there numbers in here

10 for design flow through?

11   MR. DELLA TORRE: Our expected flow

12 through numbers, the ones that formed the basis for

13 the evaluation.

14   MR. FINNEGAN: I understand that was your

15 expectation, but it looked like that expectation was

16 bounced against the actual flow through, not the

17 design flow through.

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: It's what we expected to

19 flow through versus what actually flowed through.

20   MR. WEEKS: Could we get to a specific, so

21 we can stop being general?

22   MR. FINNEGAN: Sure.

23   (Pause.)

24   MR. FINNEGAN: Okay, 15.2-2, this is on

25 page 15-12 on the April 11 version.

1   MR. WEEKS: 15.2-2. On April 11 it's

2   15-12.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Okay.

4   MR. FINNEGAN: It says the evaluation

5   criteria was Qwest systems provide valid confirm

6   order confirmations to valid LSR transactions

7   submitted via IMA EDI.

8   The response was, skipping in the comments

9   of 5467 LSRs submitted for which a FOC was expected,

10   95.52 percent received a FOC.

11   MR. DELLA TORRE: As I said, we revised

12   that number down by the number we made mistakes on.

13   We shouldn't have expected a FOC in those conditions

14   if you read the criteria strictly, the way that that

15   is accounted for is valid LSR transactions.

16   So we reduced the number of LSRs we

17   expected to flow through by that number we made

18   mistakes on, which --

19   MS. ANDERSON: 5467 represents the actual

20   number of orders that did flow through.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: You are kind of mixing and

22   matching. The numerator has the actual.

23   MR. WEEKS: It, of the 5464 orders that

24   actually did flow through regardless of how many we

25   tried to make flow through, the 5467 orders that

1   actually did flow through and received -- that should

2   have received a FOC report, we got less than a

3   hundred percent on. We got FOCs for only

4   92.52 percent. Which means there was at least one

5   order we thought originally would flow through and it

6   did not FOC. So it did not, it dropped out. So it's

7   not the numerator and, because we blew it, it's not

8   the denominator.

9   MR. FINNEGAN: You said the denominator

10   was what actually flowed through. Is it more correct

11   to say what you expected to flow through?

12   MR. WEEKS: No. Our expectations were

13   higher than what we achieved. 5467 is what we

14   achieved, not what we intended.

15   MR. DELLA TORRE: No. 5467 is what we

16   expected to flow through. And --

17   MS. ANDERSON: Wait out the ones --

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

19   MR. WEEKS: That includes the error?

20   MR. DELLA TORRE: No. About 200 didn't

21   come back. The number with the errors would be

22   higher than this number.

23   A VOICE: How may orders didn't come

24   through?

25   (Simultaneous speaking).

1   MR. DELLA TORRE: 95 percent of them

2   actually flowed through.

3   MS. ANDERSON: So if it was -- it was 594,

4   is that what you are saying?

5   MR. FINNEGAN: The numerator is the actual

6   flow through rate.

7   MR. DELLA TORRE: Let's time out for a

8   second.

9   (Pause.)

10   MR. DELLA TORRE: We had an original

11   number, let's say a higher number. I will make them

12   up to make them clear. 6,000 was our original number

13   we expected to flow through. Later we realized that

14   a bunch of those we shouldn't have expected them to

15   flow through because they were malformed. So we

16   reduced the 6,000 number to 5467 that we expected to

17   flow through because there were, they were properly

18   formed orders.

19   Of that 5467, 95.52 percent received a FOC

20   flow through.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: Okay. So this is, I will

22   characterize it as a pure measure of Qwest's ability

23   to --

24   MR. WEEKS: Return FOCs.

25   MR. FINNEGAN: -- flow through orders,

1   properly formatted flow through eligible orders.

2   MR. WEEKS: That's correct.

3   MR. FINNEGAN: There were no errors either

4   expected or unexpected by KPMG.

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: The other thing that it

6   checks, though, is orders that are not expected to

7   flow through don't, that they drop.

8   MR. CONNOLLY: It seems to me that you had

9   three categories of expectations going in. The first

10 being LSRs that would result in a FOC.

11   MR. WEEKS: Should flow through and,

12 therefore, would get a FOC.

13   MR. CONNOLLY: LSRs that should error out,

14 you rejected.

15   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

16   MR. WEEKS: Yes.

17   MR. CONNOLLY: And LSRs that should not be

18 rejected but will not FOC.

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

20   MR. WEEKS: Right then we got surprised on

21 some of the first --

22   MR. CONNOLLY: When you executed you found

23 discrepancies between what your expectations were and

24 what the realities were.

25   MR. WEEKS: That's correct.

1   MR. CONNOLLY: Then the analysis work you

2   did adjusted your three sets of initial expectations.

3   MR. WEEKS: Yes. So the numbers we report

4   here for rates like -- such as 2-2 represent of the

5   5467 that actually did flow through, how many of

6   those we got FOCs back on regardless of how many

7   others we sent expecting them to flow through and

8   they didn't.

9   MR. DELLA TORRE: If I would have listened

10   to my team earlier we could have cut to the chase

11   with table 15-13 which identifies the total number of

12   LSRs submitted, the total number of LSRs that were

13   flow through eligible, and the total number of FOCs

14   received. So it's all there.

15   MR. WEEKS: In the new revised.

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: So let us disgracefully

17   move away from this question.

18   MS. ANDERSON: Thank goodness we got that

19   cleared up.

20   MR. WEEKS: Withdraw from the field

21   bloody.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: To number 7 and 8. Both

23   HP.

24   MS. ANDERSON: Maybe we need to let AT&T

25   go first next time. They get mean. Sorry, Geoff.

1   MR. MAY: That's okay.

2   AT&T question 7:   "Describe HPC's method

3   of recording date and timestamps on the outgoing and

4   incoming IMA EDI submissions.   Specifically address

5   the points in the transaction life-cycle when HPC

6   established the date/time sent and date/time received

7   from Qwest."

8   For EDI outbound transactions it will

9   obtain transaction data from an internal tape,

10   initiate a secure socket layer, SSL session, encrypt

11   the file, transmit the data file along with the IA

12   configuration file and close the SSL session.

13   The HPC IA send process obtains the system

14   date and time from the HPC server after sending the

15   file to Qwest via socket.

16   The outbound data is inserted in an

17   internal table with a system date and time.   IA

18   proceeds to write this time to an internal table

19   within the HPC test harness database.

20   For EDI inbound transactions, the HPC IA

21   receive retrieves a byte stream from Qwest, the

22   inbound process receives the inbound responses by

23   opening an SSL session, decoding the inbound

24   response, determining the message type, EDI message

25   or receive, then logging the inbound transaction with

1   the system date when the last byte of data is

2   received. The byte stream is converted or decrypted

3   to an ASCII file and saved to a directory on the

4   server.

5   The inbound process obtains the create

6   time for this file and writes it to a table within

7   the HPC test harness database.

8   The inbound and outbound date and time

9   stamp is populated based on the system date and time

10 from the HPC Test 15 end class server. In order to

11 keep the system date and time accurate this server is

12 synchronized with the Naval Atomic Clock in Boulder,

13 Colorado. Obviously.

14   It is HPC's understanding that Qwest

15 synchronizes their servers to the Naval Atomic Clock

16 in Boulder, Colorado.

17   Any follow-ups?

18   MS. ANDERSON: Don't even ask.

19   MR. FINNEGAN: What atom is being examined

20 in Boulder, cesium?

21   (Laughter.)

22   MR. CONNOLLY: Do I understand correctly,

23 Geoff, that we couldn't look at the EDI messages and

24 determine what you have used for the date-time-sent

25 according to that set of calculations.

1   MR. MAY: That's correct.

2   We are on 8: "Describe HPC's method of

3   recording date and timestamps on the outgoing and

4   incoming IMA GUI submissions. Specifically address

5   the points in the transaction life-cycle when HPC

6   established the date/time sent and date/time received

7   from Qwest."

8   For IMA GUI outbound transactions HPC's

9   IMA GUI tool obtains the local PC machine time

10 immediately before establishing an SSL session

11 connection. The SSL source code converts into

12 transaction data -- converts -- converts the

13 transaction data to a data stream and transmits the

14 information to the ILEC. For IMA GUI inbound

15 transactions the SSL session is established and SSL

16 source code converts the response data stream into

17 transaction data on receipt of the response. The

18 tool obtains the local PC machine time immediately

19 after completing Qwest's socket connection.

20   Inbound and outbound date/time timestamp

21 is populated based on the PC machine date and time.

22   In order to keep the PC machine date and

23 time accurate, all PCs are synchronized with the HPC

24 Test 15 server date and time.

25   The HPC Test 15 server date and time is

1 synchronized with the Naval Atomic Clock in Boulder,

2 Colorado.

3   MS. ANDERSON: A common theme has

4 developed here.

5   MR. MAY: I would like also at this point

6 to read WorldCom's question number 14: "Please

7 verify, HPC was able to electronically capture

8 associated ongoing submissions and incoming responses

9 via IMA EDI and GUI."

10   Do you feel that question has been

11 answered?

12   MS. OLIVER: Yes.

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: Moving on, question 9.

14   MS. ANDERSON: Let me interrupt. Our

15 lunch has been delivered I think, or only partially

16 delivered.

17   Partially? Okay. Please continue. When

18 it comes I will interrupt again.

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 9: "Confirm

20 that the HPC date/time stamps are those used to

21 produce results in section 3.0."

22   That is correct.

23   Questions 10 through 18.

24   MR. CONNOLLY: Excuse me. Does that mean

25 HP calculated 3.0 results or did KPMG.

1   MR. WEEKS: They provided timestamps, we

2   did the calculation.

3   MR. CONNOLLY: Thank you.

4   MR. FINNEGAN: Could I ask a quick

5   question before we get into the matrix.

6   In Section 2.35, page 15.6 of the April

7   11th version, it said in the evaluation of the test

8   performance, KPMG Consulting applied the standards

9   documented in Qwest's service performance indicator

10   definitions Version 3.0 issued May 31, 2001.

11   The capacity tests or volume tests were

12   done November and January. November of 2001, January

13   of 2002.

14   MR. DELLA TORRE: Right.

15   MR. FINNEGAN: By that time Version 4.0

16   was in effect. Was there a reason 3 was used instead

17   of 4.

18   MR. WEEKS: We had the discussion about

19   what PID should be used for purposes of the test and

20   it was agreed we would use 3.0 regardless of whatever

21   changes or other morphs took place after that.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: With the Exception being

23   the use of PID 4.0 for the retest associated with, I

24   believe, Exception 34, 35, 36, somewhere in that

25   group where we did a substantial retest of 4 where we

1   used 4.0. Otherwise it was always 4.0.

2   MR. FINNEGAN: Thank you.

3   MR. CONNOLLY: One more before we get into

4   these.

5   In the volume tests and stress tests the

6   company code that was used on the transaction, RSID,

7   that was unique to volume test.

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

9   MR. CONNOLLY: And different from

10 functionality test.

11   MR. WEEKS: That's right.

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

13   MR. WEEKS: HP may want to comment. It

14 went through a different certification process with a

15 different company code than the certification code

16 they went through for each function testing.

17   MR. CONNOLLY: Right. Was the same

18 company code for the transactions used for all the

19 volume stress testing, you didn't use a --

20   MR. MAY: Yes.

21   MR. WEEKS: That's correct.

22   MR. CONNOLLY: Thank you.

23   MR. DELLA TORRE: Questions 10 through 18

24 are all of a similar nature and they are asking for a

25 possible reason, reasons between differences in

1   performance between GUI and EDI for the same

2   transaction types.

3   Our answer is that we did not perform any

4   analysis or investigate as to why those differences

5   may exist.

6   Question 19: "Explain the difference

7   between 'Time-out' and 'Non-response.'"

8   Time-out responses for pre-orders, are

9   pre-order responses where the response time is

10   greater than 200 seconds. Non-response, of course,

11   is one where there is never a response received.

12   MR. WEEKS: It's the difference between

13   late and never.

14   MR. DELLA TORRE: This particular question

15   is pre-orders, I believe.

16   Question 20: "Did KPMG Consulting

17   evaluate the completeness of the Time-out

18   transactions it observed? What deficiencies, if any,

19   were found?"

20   The answer is yes, we did assess the timed

21   out transactions. In fact, we found no discernible

22   differences in the content and structure of those

23   responses other than, of course, the response time.

24   MR. CONNOLLY: A late transaction becomes

25   a no response when you stop looking for the response.

1   MR. WEEKS: Or if you never receive it.

2   Remember, these were solicited responses in the sense

3   we sent a request and were expecting a response. One

4   eventually arrives regardless of how late the child

5   lives, it's still there and could be measured,

6   evaluated and so on. That is distinct from it never

7   ever shows up. That is the distinction we are

8   making.

9   MR. CONNOLLY: Never shows up because you

10   only have so much time to await the response, then

11   you declare it lost.

12   MR. WEEKS: Yes, beauty is what it is in

13   the eye of the beholder. One organization might wait

14   period one, someone else might wait 3 X.

15   MR. CONNOLLY: So for the ones that are

16   late, because you ultimately did receive --

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: Right. The Time-out

18   responses.

19   MR. CONNOLLY: They were well formed in

20   your terms, transaction responses, all the data were

21   in them that you needed.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: Correct.

23   MR. WEEKS: Yes, they were just tardy.

24   MR. DELLA TORRE: 21.

25   MR. FINNEGAN: Can I go back to test

 1   cross-reference 15-2-4, on page 15-13 of the April 11

 2   version, the latest version?

 3   This is somewhat related to what you

 4   discovered during the stress test. And that's if

 5   there are too many well formed, flow-through

 6   eligible, should-flow-through LSRs in the queue, they

 7   will drop out for manual processing.

 8   Do you know what triggers them to drop

 9   out? Provide some context. It appears that if the

10   queue is getting such that the 20-minute benchmark is

11   in danger of being missed, it would take perfectly

12   good, well formed should-flow-through orders and dump

13   them into manual processing. For no other reason

14   than they are going to miss the benchmark. Was that

15   your finding?

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: It was a representation

17   made, there was a representation made by Qwest in one

18   of its responses, and I don't know the numbers, we

19   did not determine --

20   (Pause.)

21   MR. DELLA TORRE: We learned of the same

22   condition you did, probably in the same manner that

23   you did, which is that when a particular queue was

24   too long and there was an assessment made that the

25   order would not be processed timely, it was dropped

1   because there was a potential indication for a

2   systems problem, therefore the order was dropped for

3   manual handling.

4   It was also represented to us that if

5   those queue lengths were going to change, so that in

6   subsequent testing we would not encounter that

7   problem, we did not do root cause analysis to

8   determine if in fact that was true. We ran

9   subsequent testing and did not see that behavior

10   indicate itself again.

11   MR. FINNEGAN: Was that, in your

12   accounting of that, between 95 and a hundred percent

13   discussion we had before, where your expectation was

14   it should have flowed through? There was nothing

15   wrong with the order, but it didn't flow through.

16   Did any of your accounting attribute the non-flow

17   through to too many in the queue at the time and it

18   dumped it out?

19   MR. WEEKS: We didn't do root cause as far

20   as I know.

21   (Pause.)

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: The total number was

23   accounted for, our team did look at it and that was a

24   potential cause, this queue limitation, if you will.

25   We did account for all of them. But we do

 1   not have that in here in any of the tables

 2   represented in the back.

 3   (Pause.)

 4   MR. DELLA TORRE: And we don't have the

 5   specific number that could be attributed to that

 6   condition.

 7   MS. ANDERSON: Qwest had their hand up

 8   back there.

 9   MS. NOTARIANNI: Lynn Notarianni. I want

10   to be real clear about something, so the wrong back

11   and forth impression isn't left here. Qwest has not

12   built or set anything in their system to trigger off,

13   and never did, to trigger off if something was not

14   an -- an FOC was not returned in 20 minutes it would

15   drop to a manual queue. I don't think we ever

16   represented that in a response to a TI.

17   There can be conditions based on load

18   coming into the system where a number of things can

19   queue up. If it is having trouble functioning as it

20   should, and there is parameters you can -- as you

21   tune all systems, to handle certain things and when

22   certain error conditions start happening to treat the

23   situation a certain way, and I think that is what

24   KPMG is responding to and what they encountered in

25   the test, that during the one test when we

1   encountered some of that, when we went back to look

2   at how we could, in the future, not have those

3   situations occur.

4   We tuned our systems as well as we

5   monitored for degradation in our system and when that

6   happens we have ways of recycling our systems very

7   quickly so it clears it out and you don't have to

8   drop things to manual queue.

9   So I didn't want the impression left that

10   Qwest had, per a particular parameter set up their

11   system to treat it one way or another, so a PID would

12   come out with a certain calculation.

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: That is consistent with

14   the Exception, response to the Exception 3091 where

15   the representation is that it is load based, not time

16   based.

17   MR. FINNEGAN: But what's the difference?

18   If there are flow-through eligible, has gone to the

19   determination it's flow through eligible and ends up

20   in a queue, why would that ever drop out for manual

21   processing? What would trigger it? You know it's a

22   good flow through order, it's in the queue. I

23   understand you say it's load. But what does that

24   mean in terms of the order?

25   MS. NOTARIANNI: Okay, specifically what

1   can happen in terms of the system is, and again, we

2   now have processes in place, we monitor them, KPMG

3   retested them, we didn't see the same situations

4   occur.

5   But when you have got an operational

6   support system and when your -- when you are

7   processing transactions within the system and the --

8   you can get your system to a point where it ties up

9   and you are in a sense not processing transactions

10   anymore.

11   At those points in time, you can tune your

12   systems and set them up to have certain things

13   happening versus others.

14   So we would rather continue to process the

15   orders. If that means some things have to drop out

16   to manual handling, maybe then it does.

17   But systems can and different scenarios

18   can trigger it, cause different situations where

19   those transactions are tied up and just not

20   processing and they are coming at a dead state. So

21   you need to move it along while then you recycle your

22   systems and --

23   So again, there is no specific that says

24   this is always going to happen this one time or

25   another, but as with all systems, load conditionals

1   can cause certain things to happen.

2   MR. DELLA TORRE: If I understand the

3   treatment or evaluation of this sort of condition,

4   these orders would still be treated in terms of

5   timeliness and performance under say PID reporting

6   kind of conditions.

7   MS. NOTARIANNI: Correct.

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: As flow-through orders

9   even if they were not responsive to the --

10   MR. FINNEGAN: I don't think so. That is

11   my concern.

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: We have conditions where

13   we have flow-through eligible orders that should have

14   flowed through that did not, acknowledges and says

15   those are going to count against us.

16   MR. FINNEGAN: We will see in the, perhaps

17   the data reconciliations.

18   But the way the PID is designed for PO5,

19   it's electronically submitted and processed. If it's

20   flow-through eligible and it gets dumped because the

21   queue is too long, that is going to go into the

22   electronically submitted manually processed bucket

23   and instead of a 20-minute benchmark. It's going to

24   be measured against a 24-hour benchmark.

25   Am I incorrect in my assumption?

1   MS. VIVEROS: No, John, you are correct.

2   That is the definition within PO5.

3   And you are right, in a condition where a

4   flow-through eligible LSR came in and through the

5   load got backed up in the queue and was dropped for

6   manual handling Qwest wouldn't take a hit in PO5 A.

7   However, it is a flow-through eligible

8   LSR, therefore it would still be counted in the PO2

9   results. It still would be marked against Qwest as

10   an order that should have flowed through but did not.

11   That's really what we are attempting to measure.

12   What was the level of flow-through.

13   This was a Qwest caused condition, so we

14   would count that order in the denominator of PO2,

15   both A and B, and take a hit for it in the numerator

16   because it wouldn't be there.

17   MR. FINNEGAN: It just seems to make the

18   KI05A, electronically submitted, electronically

19   processed timeliness measure for FOCs somewhat

20   meaningless.

21   MR. WEEKS: That has evolved to a

22   discussion --

23   MR. DELLA TORRE: And I would like you to

24   indulge me in one additional question, number 21:

25   "Does KPMG Consulting have an opinion on the volume

1   levels that cause the Qwest processing of flow

2   through LSRs to deteriorate?

3   Answer is no.

4   "Please provide volume thresholds for

5   pre-order and order volumes that appear to be the

6   cross-over point between continuous operation and

7   queue back up."

8   And it's unknown.

9   Other questions.

10   MR. SPINKS: Tom Spinks from Washington.

11   Going back to the questions 10 through 18.

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes.

13   MR. SPINKS: I don't understand the

14 results because it seems counterintuitive that the

15 peak volume times would be less than normal volume

16 times for the order times across the board.

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: I believe these

18 questions are actually referring to GUI versus EDI.

19 You may be raising a different question.

20   MR. SPINKS: Then if you look at table

21 15-8 and 15-9 the IAM EDI, pre-order response times,

22 the times in table 15-9 for peak day are lower than

23 the average response times during normal --

24   MR. DELLA TORRE: Actually, 15-8 and 9

25 again are a comparison between EDI and GUI, both for

1 peak days.

2   MR. WEEKS: You are looking at a figure,

3 he is looking at a table.

4   MS. THIELEMANN: But I think we may have

5 some numbering problems, too.

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: Please continue. My

7 apologies.

8   MR. WEEKS: He is saying the normal day as

9 you look at the average, the min and max and so on,

10 that peak day for example for our LDQ, minimal for

11 normal was 2, minimum for peak was 8. Maximum for

12 normal was 71 and the maximum for peak was 55. Those

13 are just mins and maxes.

14   MR. SPINKS: I am looking at the average

15 response times. 14.79, well --

16   MR. WEEKS: I mean they are different.

17   MR. SPINKS: I looking at ADQ.

18   MR. WEEKS: An average is an average.

19   MR. SPINKS: Where the response time of

20 the peak was less than response time during the

21 normal.

22   MR. WEEKS: But look at the max number on

23 the normal day, 61 and max on peak was only 23. So

24 averages can be distorted by extremes.

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: Quite honestly, I am

1   sure we can go through a variety of scenarios that

2   would be fairly logical and based on some experience

3   and exposure, but it would be speculation.

4   MR. SPINKS: What I was wondering was do

5   the plus systems during a week time that are coming

6   into a particular order center get to a certain point

7   where during this peak load it says okay now start

8   sending these orders over to this other place, so

9   that what you wind up with, during peak times is

10 actually faster processing than during normal times

11 when --

12   MR. WEEKS: We were doing black box

13 testing, I would have no way of knowing the answer to

14 that question. What was going on behind the scenes I

15 really wouldn't be able to tell you.

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: We are not aware of any

17 overflow systems of the type you are talking about,

18 but in fact, if that improved the performance, well,

19 that is a good thing that would come out in this

20 test.

21   The greater the performance, the more

22 horsepower they bring on line to address it, that

23 would actually be a very good thing.

24   Other questions on the volume test?

25   Okay. Thank you. Most folks have food.

1 Denise? Take five I suppose?

2   MS. ANDERSON: Yes. Let's take 10 minutes

3 to get drinks, eat. Then we will reengage.

4   (LUNCHEON RECESS -- 12:17 P.M.)

5   * * * * *

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

 1   (AFTERNOON SESSION -- 12:23 P.M.)

 2   TEST 18 - M&R End-to-End Trouble Report Processing

 3   MR. WEEKS: Test 18 is the trouble

 4   reporting process test. For those of you looking at

 5   reports, this is hot off the press, latest and

 6   greatest is April 14. We have made revisions there.

 7   The current state of things are that there are ten

 8   SATs, two not SATs, one unable is kind of the current

 9   state of events. We will jump in there without a lot

10   of further intro.

11   MR. DELLA TORRE: Test 18, question 1:

12   AT&T. Asks about your reference to Section V, and

13   that section is our PID reporting PID evaluation

14   section that will come out with the draft final

15   report.

16   Question number 2.

17   (Pause.)

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8

19   were all questions for the -- requests for the

20   supporting data KPMG used to calculate the various

21   numbers in the specific references. We have passed

22   out the tables with the data on it.

23   I believe an e-mail was sent earlier this

24   morning to a wider audience to include folks on the

25   bridge. So any questions that may come up from this

1   we can take in the next VTC.

2   (Pause.)

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: All of the related

4   product times and underlying numbers are provided in

5   the supplemental hand-out that we provided. We did

6   not in fact, however, review all of those. I believe

7   the report section states that subset we did

8   evaluate.

9   So there is a lot of information to digest

10   there. We certainly will be willing to take

11   questions on that data at some future point.

12   Let's move to question number 9.

13   Excuse me.

14   (Pause.)

15   MR. DELLA TORRE: Just a point of

16   clarification, in the report, there is a table that

17   exists that shows what products (inaudible).

18   You can use that as a cross-reference --

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 9: "Please

20   indicate whether Qwest's incorrect application of

21   close out codes resulted in any trouble reports being

22   inappropriately excluded from Qwest's maintenance and

23   repair PID calculations or 'no access' time being

24   improperly excluded from applicable maintenance and

25   repair results.

 1   If Qwest was miscoding orders such that

 2   orders or time were inappropriately excluded from

 3   Qwest's maintenance and repair PID results, please

 4   indicate the impact of the inappropriate exclusions."

 5   KPMG Consulting did not audit Qwest's

 6   calculations or exclusions of the (inaudible) --

 7   reference to the Liberty Consulting report.

 8   MR. FINNEGAN: Apart from that, the

 9   evaluation criteria, last line talks about dispatch

10   of the technician are consistent with the troubles

11   placed on the line.

12   So in the context of this evaluation

13   criteria --

14   MR. DELLA TORRE: Which criteria set?

15   MR. FINNEGAN: 18.6.1, accuracy of coding.

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: Which is it not

17   satisfied.

18   MR. FINNEGAN: Yes. I understand it's not

19   satisfied, but in the context of this evaluation was

20   Qwest miscoded or applying close out codes that

21   pointed toward some sort of customer caused delay or

22   customer problem?

23   MR. WEEKS: If I remember right the first

24   two digits, correct me if I am wrong, the first two

25   digits of the close out codes we agreed with. It was

1   the last two digits of the close out codes that we

2   didn't always agree with.

3   MR. GUZDAR: In general the second two

4   codes were incorrect, were the ones that were causing

5   the incorrect coding.

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: The first two were

7   categorization of the type, whereas the second two

8   were a specific identification of what the trouble

9   was.

10   MR. GUZDAR: Correct.

11   MR. WEEKS: So the attribution to CLEC

12 versus whatever I believe gets covered off the first

13 two; is that accurate or not? It's not always that

14 specific.

15   MR. FINNEGAN: Is that something you find

16 out? I understand generally but if you had a Qwest

17 code and started off with a C as some sort of

18 customer disposition code --

19   MR. WEEKS: Is the question you are asking

20 is to validate whether or not coding could be missed?

21 The coding errors we saw would have caused the coding

22 error to be attributed to the wrong company? Do you

23 know that for a fact?

24   We did not see a situation in the testing

25 we did where the errors in coding we observed would

1   have caused it to be allocated to the wrong company.

2   MR. FINNEGAN: Okay.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 10: "Given

4   that 'Qwest instituted measures to increase frequency

5   of internal audits and expand the scope of the FCC

6   SAVER audits to improve close out code accuracy

7   levels' and those measures only improved accuracy of

8   Qwest's close out coding by 0.5 percent, what is KPMG

9   Consulting's opinion on the effectiveness of this

10   Qwest quality improvement effort?"

11   KPMG Consulting renders no opinion on this

12   performance.

13   I believe that takes us to WorldCom

14   questions, any other questions on the AT&T section?

15   WorldCom number 1: "At what point

16   following the SOC of a CLEC order can a CLEC

17   electronically submit a trouble ticket for that

18   order?"

19   And we did confirm that they can be

20   submitted immediately after delivery of the SOC.

21   Question 2: "How are trouble tickets

22   handled electronically vs. manually?"

23   Answer is they are, in fact, processed in

24   the same manner.

25   MR. WEEKS: We assume that means submitted

1   electronically versus submitted manually.

2   MR. DELLA TORRE: Then how those are

3   subsequently processed.

4   MR. WEEKS: We interpreted the question in

5   the following way. Regardless of the way the CLEC

6   submits the trouble ticket, electronically or

7   manually, once in the system the way it's processed,

8   there is no difference with respect to how it was

9   entered.

10   MS. OLIVER: That is kind of what I think

11   our next question is asking.

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: And our answer to that

13   question was yes, in fact, they are processed the

14   same way. I.

15   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

16   (Pause.)

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: For scope and nature of

18   this test versus some of the other sections, a lot of

19   the process based questions were not the scope of

20   these tests. These were, as we call, black box or

21   transaction based tests.

22   MS. OLIVER: What are the process aspects

23   addressed in another test.

24   MR. WEEKS: Yes.

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: 18-7 and 18-8.

1   MS. OLIVER: I did have a follow-up to

2   question number 1. You said you did find the ticket

3   could be submitted immediately following issuance of

4   the SOC.

5   (Pause.)

6   MS. OLIVER: That's probably better.

7   Sorry, I thought the microphone was on.

8   I can repeat the follow-up question I had

9   on number 1, which was to confirm that what KPMG

10   reported that a ticket could be submitted immediately

11   following issuance of a SOC, that that ticket could

12   be electronically submitted via both electronic

13   methods, that it would process the same.

14   MR. GUZDAR: We only tested this through

15   the GUI, we did not do that through the EBTA.

16   That also, as an FYI, that was done as a

17   different test, not 18, that was done in test 16

18   which will be coming up later on.

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: We may be able to

20   readdress this in the third conference.

21   MS. OLIVER: So the response to question 1

22   should be made with that caveat, electronically

23   submitted through the GUI, correct?

24   MR. GUZDAR: That is correct.

25   MS. OLIVER: Okay, thanks.

1   MR. DELLA TORRE: So I think we are on

2   number 4: "Are the trouble tickets numbers assigned

3   automatically by WFA/C or LMOS? If so, what triggers

4   this automatic assignment?"

5   The answer is yes, it is assigned

6   automatically and the trigger is the initial creation

7   of new trouble --

8   Question 5: "What procedures are employed

9   by Qwest to ensure adequate and timely status updates

10   are provided to CLECs?"

11   Both MEDIACC and CEMR send change of

12   status notice to the CLEC. Additionally the CLEC can

13   call and request status at will throughout the life

14   of the report.

15   Finally the process requires the CLEC to

16   be notified when the trouble is cleared or closed.

17   Question 6: "What factors are used by

18   LMOS to generate the commitment date and time?"

19   The commitment intervals are controlled by

20   the LRAC and are based on technician availability,

21   existing work volume, by geographic area.

22   Question 7: "Is there a standard

23   resolution timeframe for non-designed service trouble

24   processed via LMOS.

25   Qwest does have work center objectives,

1   however the intervals may fluctuate based on business

2   needs.

3   MS. OLIVER: Is that Qwest's objective

4   published?

5   (Pause.)

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: Those are not published

7   publicly.

8   All right.

9   MR. CRAIN: What was the question? Andy

10 Crain.

11   MS. LUBAMERSKY: Nancy Lubamersky.

12   The question you asked, it is not publicly

13 available.

14   MR. WEEKS: Number 7: "Is there a

15 standard resolution timeframe for non-designed

16 service trouble processed via LMOS?"

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: We referenced specific

18 work centers had specific objectives, but that that

19 is internal information and not published.

20   Question 8: "Please clarify, first-in,

21 first-out basis means oldest ticket will receive the

22 first dispatched service available regardless of type

23 or capacity."

24   And we believe that that is a

25 misunderstanding of what we were attempting to

1   illustrate in that the work is prioritized by type or

2   capacity of service.

3   MR. WEEKS: And then FIFO is applied. If

4   you will it's queues, different types of work, then

5   FIFO within the queue, so there may be some work

6   going on within one queue actually submitted later

7   than other work in other queues that may not know

8   what the nature of those other queues looks like.

9   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 9: "Is the

10   CLEC required to authorize additional testing and

11   fault isolation activities?"

12   The answer is no.

13   Question 10: "Why is this process

14   specific to manually entered trouble tickets?"

15   Let me provide context. "If trouble

16   tickets are entered manually, Qwest screeners and

17   Design Service Center (DSC) testers offer assistance

18   with Resale and Unbundled Network Element-Platform

19   (UNE-P) service fault identification by testing the

20   Qwest network to isolate or determine the location of

21   faults."

22   The question is why is this process

23   specific to manually entered trouble tickets.

24   The response is if the report is entered

25   via CEMR, the CLEC goes through the RC diagnostic

1   review as part of the trouble create process.

2   MS. ANDERSON: Folks on the bridge, could

3   we please implore you to put your mute buttons on.

4   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 11: "Please

5   verify the, for UNE-P CLECs are not responsible for

6   isolating the nature and location of faults prior to

7   submitting a trouble ticket."

8   That is correct.

9   Question 12: "Utilizing Qwest interfaces

10   (MEDIACC or CEMR), what testing mechanisms are

11   available to CLECs? Please clarify what 'associated

12   Qwest circuit identification' is required to be

13   provided when a CLEC submits a trouble ticket for an

14   UNE -- excluding UNE-P."

15   For resale and UNE-P the mechanism is

16   mechanized loop test or MLT, that is not intended for

17   UNE testing.

18   The second question regarding the circuit

19   identification, that is actually the CLEC provided

20   telephone number associated with the circuit

21   identification.

22   Okay.

23   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

24   Clarification on -- you said the Qwest, associated

25   Qwest circuit identification is actually the TN?

1   MR. WEEKS: It's the TN that the CLEC uses

2   or associates with Qwest's circuit ID.

3   MS. ANDERSON: Qwest wants to say

4   something?

5   MR. VIVEROS: I, maybe I am

6   misinterpreting the question. Since this is

7   excluding UNE-P, the circuit identifier we would be

8   expecting for a trouble report like in the case of an

9   unbundeled loop would be in fact the circuit ID that

10   we assigned to that UNE-P.

11   MR. WEEKS: So you just want the raw

12   circuit ID, you don't care about anything else.

13   MR. VIVEROS: I don't. I have no

14   cross-reference to the end-user's telephone number.

15   We don't have that information.

16   MR. WEEKS: I realize you don't have it.

17   You couldn't use that in any way to help you diagnose

18   or fix the problem?

19   MR. VIVEROS: No.

20   MR. DELLA TORRE: Our understanding is

21   that there is a request made for the associated

22   telephone number, that the reports are based on the

23   circuit ID, as Chris indicated, but there is a

24   request for the associated telephone number and how

25   that may be used is not --

          1   MR. WEEKS: Not clear to us now. We

          2   thought it was clear. But maybe it isn't. It's

          3   based on the interface requirements of what CLECs are

          4   required to put in when they turn in the trouble

          5   ticket. It's our understanding CLECs are asked to

          6   provide that TN as part of the trouble reporting

          7   process.

          8   MR. DELLA TORRE: Even if you are using

          9   the circuit ID as your main key to the account.

         10   MR. VIVEROS: Two points. I am looking at

         11   the literal that is in this question, and it's

         12   talking about the associated Qwest circuit

         13   identifications. That would be the circuit ID that

         14   Qwest has assigned to that UNE, either the circuit ID

         15   for the loop, the circuit ID for the EO.

         16   MS. ANDERSON: We agree.

         17   MR. VIVEROS: There may be some limited

         18   circumstances after a recent conversion to loop and

         19   number portability where the telephone number would

         20   certainly be useful information.

         21   MR. DELLA TORRE: You are right there.

         22   MR. VIVEROS: We would be looking for

         23   that.

         24   MR. DELLA TORRE: There was a disconnect

         25   on the understanding. You are absolutely right. We

1   misread that question.   Excuse me.

2   MS. OLIVER: I did have an additional

3   follow-up.   KPMG stated MLT is the testing mechanism

4   used for UDP and resale.

5   I thought I had understood that the

6   response to question 10 stated that if there was an

7   RC diagnostic testing mechanism available in CEMR for

8   EDP, is that the same as MLT.

9   MR. DINSMORE: No it is not.   The RCD is a

10   diagnostic process you go through to actually look

11   for trouble that asks intelligent questions and takes

12   down what to enter in order MLT visibly tests the

13   circuits.

14   MR. DELLA TORRE: For point of reference

15   that was Nolan Dinsmore.

16   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 13:   "Is fault

18   isolation for POTS (non-designed) service conducted

19   after the ticket is accepted either electronically or

20   manually, and created in LMOS?"

21   The answer is, not as a rule.   However it

22   can be done if necessary.

23   Question 14:   "Once the fault location is

24   determined, the trouble is routed 'IN' to the central

25   office (CO) through the Work Force

1   Administration/Dispatch In (WFA/DI) system, or 'OUT'

2   to an outside technician through the Work Force

3   Administration/Dispatch Out (WFA/DO) system for

4   repair completion. Please verify, Qwest personnel

5   will make the determination for WFA/DI vs. WFA/DO."

6   And that is correct.

7   Question 15: "What audit and control

8   procedures are employed by Qwest to ensure CLECs are

9   notified and the trouble tickets are closed?"

10   This is better discovered in 18-7 or 8.

11   However for purposes of responding to the question,

12   for design services a technician is required to enter

13   a remark to confirm CLEC notification and once the

14   tester restores the trouble it goes to a scrubber for

15   review of codes, times, and narratives, to ensure

16   compliance.

17   For non-design service Qwest process

18   requires CLEC notification and commitment in an area

19   and Qwest samples closed troubles for quality and

20   compliance.

21   My apologies. Qwest process requires CLEC

22   notification and comment. It's not a commitment.

23   Question 16: "Would the technician close

24   a trouble ticket without verifying trouble resolution

25   with the CLEC first?"

1   The process does require that CLEC

2   verification and notification happen before the

3   close-out, but that doesn't necessarily mean the CLEC

4   will respond, and, therefore, there is a process for

5   leaving three messages over a 24-hour period if a

6   live person is not reached.

7   Question 17 --

8   MS. TRIBBY: Mary Tribby, AT&T. After

9   three messages in 24 hours and there is no response

10 it gets closed; is that correct? What you are

11 saying?

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes.

13   MR. WEEKS: If it was electronically

14 submitted it will get an electronic notification in

15 addition to the calls.

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: Right. This series of

17 questions are covered in the process tests, 18-7,

18 18-8 and the clue to that is the beginning of this

19 next question: "What audit and control procedures

20 are employed by Qwest to ensure CORAC or LRAC

21 personnel adequately and efficiently close the

22 trouble tickets on behalf of the technician?

23   And we are unaware of any specific or

24 unique audit measures for this particular process.

25   All right.

1   MS. ANDERSON: Excuse me. You mentioned

2   that there are several questions in here that are

3   18-7 and 8. Do we still have several of those left?

4   Would it be appropriate to just skip them?

5   MS. ANDERSON: We are.

6   (Pause.)

7   MS. ANDERSON: We are a little behind.

8   MR. WEEKS: We don't mind if these are

9   being posed as follow-up questions. We will be happy

10   to answer them.

11   MR. DELLA TORRE: We will go through

12   question 17, 18 and 19 while the team identifies

13   those covered by 18-7 and 8, then move past those.

14   MS. ANDERSON: Thank you, I appreciate

15   that.

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 18: "How does

17   the RCHC and/or CRSAB know when the technician,

18   CORAC, or LRAC has closed a ticket.

19   The answer is they will check the system

20   where they would know if the report had been closed.

21   Question 19: "Did KPMG make any

22   assessment as to the accuracy of the provided, quote,

23   'objective date and time for repair of the service'?"

24   The answer is no.

25   It appears as though we can go to question

1   24.   Each of the others are identified in 18-7 or

2   18-8.

3   Question 24, and I will provide context.

4   "Qwest provisioned a test bed of circuits based on

5   requirements specifications provided by KPMG

6   Consulting that included test design input received

7   from the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) Technical

8   Advisory Group (TAG). Specifically what actions are

9   performed by Qwest to establish a test bed of

10   circuits?"

11   And this is not unlike the discussion we

12   had earlier on management test bed where we provided

13   a list of specifications to Qwest in advance of the

14   test that Qwest reported.

15   And we then upon receiving that

16   information back verified the original state, if you

17   will, of each of the circuits received.

18   Those verifications by the way were

19   conducted physically. So we are just going through

20   the rest at this point.

21   MS. ANDERSON: Okay.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 25: "How were

23   the test bed circuits distinguishable from

24   non-test-bed production circuits?"

25   There was nothing to distinguish them.

1   Question 26: "How were the test bed

2   circuit faults distinguishable from faults of

3   non-test-bed production circuits?"

4   The faults placed were standard physical

5   conditions routinely found on customer accounts. The

6   faults were placed on lines requiring Qwest

7   technicians to troubleshoot as they would any other

8   customer trouble.

9   The faults were reported by the pseudo

10   CLEC rather than KPMG Consulting to adhere to

11   blindness and the Qwest employee would likely have no

12   way to know that the pseudo CLEC was associated with

13   the troubles that we have inserted.

14   Question 27: "Which faults were

15   physically inserted, and which were virtually

16   inserted?"

17   The follow-on. "How was a fault virtually

18   inserted for a circuit?"

19   The answer, physically inserted were

20   wiring troubles, both in the central office and at

21   field locations.

22   The virtually inserted were central office

23   vertical feature type problems.

24   KPMG was responsible and directed in the

25   process of the fault insertions.

1   Question 28: "Please verify, KPMG and/or

2   PCLEC personnel witnessed Qwest inserting faults on

3   all the circuits. What verification steps were taken

4   by KPMG and/or PCLEC personnel to insure faults were

5   induced correctly?"

6   As I said, we did direct and witnessed

7   insertion of faults. Then we also checked each of

8   those faults afterward to make sure that they were

9   functioning as we expected them to be.

10   Then also after the faults were put in,

11   the circuits were again tested to ensure that the

12   fault was placed correctly.

13   MS. OLIVER: What methods did KPMG use to

14   do this actual verification of the faults or

15   existence of the faults?

16   MR. DINSMORE: Noland Dinsmore, KPMG.

17   Depends on the type of fault. If it was a

18   feature control, we used the telephone. We had one

19   person monitor the line and another person call up to

20   see if the call forwarding worked. If it was a

21   physical trouble we used the handheld telephone test

22   sets Qwest provided. We actually went across the

23   circuit to see if it was dial tone or absence of dial

24   tone.

25   So we physically verified it as a tester

1   would troubleshoot.

2   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 29: "What

4   source(s) did KPMG use to verify Qwest appropriately

5   documented the repairs made and that the trouble had

6   been resolved?"

7   Our steps were that after the repair the

8   detailed trouble history was examined to make sure

9   that the work was properly documented.

10   Then the tester returned and actually

11   examined the circuit to ensure the fault place was

12   corrected and the circuit returned to the original

13   working state.

14   Question 30: "Please verify, KPMG did

15   determine the accuracy of the closeout codes for

16   those tickets initiated by the PCLEC on behalf of

17   this test.

18   That is correct.

19   31: "What audit and controls did KPMG

20   employ to verify testers maintained a record of all

21   key data elements associated with each trouble

22   processed?"

23   Clarification. In your reference to

24   testers, are you referring to KPMG Consulting

25   personnel?

1   MS. OLIVER: I will need to follow up with

2   that question.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Thank you.

4   MR. WEEKS: Provided that you are asking

5   about what our test results were, the answer is there

6   was a master spreadsheet that we had all of our

7   testers fill out, then we consolidated all that

8   information about each trouble, took the aggregate of

9   all the troubles we observed.

10   If by that you meant the repair people

11   from Qwest, then we didn't actually work in the

12   field with the actual repair folks. As has been

13   stated, we went in and set up the problem, went away,

14   let the field people from Qwest do what they normally

15   would do.

16   Then we came back and looked to see

17   whether the repair we had inserted had actuality been

18   fixed. So we weren't actually there at the time the

19   tech was fixing the problem.

20   MS. OLIVER: Okay.

21   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 32: "Please

22   verify, given KPMG could not determine if Qwest's

23   performance was in parity with its retail

24   performance, the results of this report should

25   reflect, quote, 'unable to determine,' while noting

1   the results of the ROC TAG review.

2   And this is just a matter of agreement, in

3   terms of the test, when no decision was reached in

4   the dual test system, that it was brought to the TAG,

5   the TAG votes and that was then the close up and for

6   the conclusion. And I think that our comments

7   articulated that position fairly clearly.

8   Question 33 is the same concept.

9   Other questions? Test 18? Great. Thank

10   you.

11   MS. ANDERSON: We are now moving to 24.8.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
 1              Test 24.8 - Interconnect Service

 2                 Center (ISC) Support Review

 3              MR. WEEKS:  ISC support review.  The

 4   underline there is on support.  So at this time the

 5   date of the report that is the latest and greatest is

 6   April 12th and it has all SATs in it.

 7              Are you ready?  Okay.

 8              MR. DELLA TORRE:  WorldCom number 1:  "Is

 9   the division of responsibility between the ISC

10   locations transparent to CLECs?

11              No.

12              Follow-on question:  "If not, how are the

13   responsibilities of the various ISC locations

14   communicated to the CLECs?"

15              The CLECs are notified through their

16   service managers and/or via the wholesale web sites

17   of the proper numbers to call depending upon the

18   issue in question.

19              I will go a little bit more quickly, so

20   please be aggressive about stopping me when you have

21   follow-up questions.

22              2:  "Please clarify what is meant by

23   'Program Manager at out-sourced facilities.'"

24              Program manager is the equivalent of the

25   team leader within a Qwest service.
```

1   Question 3: "What are the specific roles

2   and responsibilities of the Coaches and Service

3   Delivery Coordinators?"

4   Coaches responsibilities include but are

5   not limited to overseeing a team of SECs, conducting

6   performance analysis, providing assistance needed,

7   responding to issues, and providing reporting data

8   and tools to the center manager.

9   Question 4: "What evidence did KPMG

10   obtain to determine these centers are, quote,

11   'staffed with representatives who are specifically

12   trained to handle questions regarding order status,

13   rejection notices, delayed orders and other order

14   process questions.'"

15   KPMG conducted interviews and on site

16   observations of staff, of Tier 0 graphs and --

17   My apologies. During the interviews and

18   observations we determined and learned that the Tier

19   0 reps did receive specific training to handle the

20   specific order processing questions. And we had

21   specific training materials such as the CSIE training

22   materials, (inaudible) system training, and

23   product-specific training.

24   Question 5: "Which menu options should be

25   selected by CLECs for UNE-P (or Loop with Port)?"

1   The answer is number 5.

2   MS. OLIVER: Back to question 4. Did

3 KPMG's observations include an assessment on the

4 adequacy of that training to handle the questions.

5   (Pause.)

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: Could you ask the

7 question again?

8   MS. OLIVER: Sure. Follow-up to question

9 4. Did KPMG's observations include an assessment of

10 the adequacy of the training as far as enabling the

11 reps to address the CLEC questions.

12   MR. WEEKS: I think question 5.

13   (Pause.)

14   MR. PETRY: It's question 4 on my sheet.

15 They split that into two parts and answered it as

16 question 1 and question 2.

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: So we will downgrade

18 them by one as we go along.

19   Where were we?

20   MR. WEEKS: Adequacy of training for reps.

21   MR. DELLA TORRE: The answer is no, we did

22 not.

23   Question 6: "Is a ticket created if the

24 Tier 0 SDC is able to fully address the CLEC's

25 inquiry at the time of the original call?"

1   Yes.

2   Question 7: "Did KPMG witness a customer

3   being placed into a queue or was this information

4   derived from documented procedures?"

5   KPMG Consulting did observe reps answering

6   calls.

7   Question 8: "Is there an established time

8   limit for how long a CLEC caller could be on hold, in

9   queue, before being routed to a SDC?"

10   No, there is not a time limit. There are

11 center objectives. There is not a limit.

12   Question 9: "Is the SDC able to access

13 caller's order information? Is the SDC able to

14 access caller's order information using just the PON?

15   The answer is yes to both.

16   10: "Did KPMG witness these procedures

17 being employed by the Tier 0 representative?"

18   Yes, we did.

19   Number 11: "Please clarify. What happens

20 to the caller attempting to escalate to Tier 1 SDC?"

21   The caller is wrong transferred, if

22 desired.

23   Qwest policy states a Tier 0

24 representative will make three attempts to wrong

25 transfer an issue to Tier 1. If unsuccessful, the

1   Tier 0 representative will advise the customer of

2   such and commit that a Tier 1 representative will

3   return the call in 30 minutes.

4   Question 12: "If the" --

5   MS. OLIVER: Excuse me. Did KPMG observe

6   that process?

7   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes, we did.

8   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

9   MR. DELLA TORRE: We did not see the three

10 attempts fail. So we did not see the failure

11 condition where three tries are made by Tier 0 to

12 Tier 1.

13   MR. WEEKS: All the transfers were.

14   MR. GRIFFING: On the first try?

15   MR. WEEKS: Not necessarily, but before

16 the third.

17   MR. DELLA TORRE: Please clarify -- "if

18 the caller plus ticket is placed in queue, is there a

19 threshold as to the amount of time a call ticket will

20 remain in queue?"

21   In this context it is not placed in queue,

22 the tickets are.

23   12: "Is there any one party responsible

24 for seeing the tickets from open to closed status?"

25   The answer is no.

1   This is similar to a question we discussed

2   before where responsibility is transferred with the

3   call.

4   MR. PETRY: I think that was actuality

5   12. I think you split your 11 into two questions.

6   So now we are two off for future reference.

7   MR. WEEKS: So any one party is actually

8   12?

9   MR. PETRY: Yes.

10   MR. WEEKS: Thank you.

11   MR. DELLA TORRE: 13: "Each ticket is

12   assigned a resolution interval, according to the

13   severity of the issue. Who is responsible for

14   assigning a resolution interval?"

15   Tier 0 call center rep.

16   14: "Are there documented intervals for

17   when a SDC is required to notify the CLEC of any

18   status changes? If so, are they adhered to?"

19   According to Qwest policy SDCs are

20   required to notify CLECs any time there is a change

21   in status and KPMG Consulting observed Qwest

22   representatives providing CLECs with status updates.

23   15: "What method is used by Qwest to sync

24   up Exact orders with delayed orders in the Lotus

25   Notes database?"

1   The method employed is manual.

2   16: "What date-related information is

3   downloaded into HEET and what is the source of these

4   dates?"

5   Answer, the HEET tool includes details on

6   due date, reason for escalation and external notes.

7   This information is downloaded from a Lotus Notes

8   database. This is for ASR orders only. The relevant

9   section in the report is 2.1.2.2.

10   Follow-on: "Is the date-related

11 information downloaded into HEET manually or via an

12 automated process?"

13   MR. PETRY: That is still part of 16.

14   MS. ANDERSON: We are three off.

15   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 17 --

16   MS. OLIVER: I am sorry I missed the

17 response.

18   MR. WEEKS: Automated.

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: Sorry. 16, the answer

20 is automated.

21   For 17: "Is the CLEC required to request

22 issues get escalated to a senior member of the center

23 staff, or the CLEC assigned service manager?"

24   The answer is either the CLEC or the Qwest

25 SDC can request an escalation.

1   Order related issues would be handled by

2   the center staff, whereas non-order related issues

3   would be handled by the service manager.

4   Question 18: "Did KPMG witness the team

5   identifying process improvements, making necessary

6   system or process adjustments, revising process

7   documentation and/or issuing notification of the

8   change to Qwest staff?"

9   KPMG Consulting witnessed quality analysis

10   of tickets and trend analyses being performed.

11   We have examples of end-to-end process

12   improvement measurements for IMA ticket handling

13   which includes quality analysis of the tickets, trend

14   analyses, process adjustments, communication of

15   process adjustments and feedback from the process

16   adjustments.

17   19: "Did KPMG witness the LRM adhering to

18   the above responsibilities?"

19   The answer is yes, KPMG Consulting

20   witnessed the twice-daily force loading call and

21   analysis of data for that call.

22   Question 20: Context. "During periods of

23   high order/call volume, Qwest has procedures in place

24   to use overtime (voluntary and mandatory) or

25   cross-trained SDCs and/or shifts work between ISC

1   locations, in order to accommodate variances in

2   demand. Are these procedures documented?"

3   The answer to this is documented in Qwest

4   document ISC Primary And Backup Locations By

5   Function.

6   21: "Are the IT long-term system capacity

7   management procedures documented and adhered to?"

8   Capacity management for the interfaces is

9   actually covered under 24.6, interface development,

10   and is not within the scope of this section of the

11   test.

12   22: "What Qwest systems are included in

13   the IT Team's capacity assessment of quarterly

14   wholesale demands?"

15   And that would be the same test 24.6.

16   Question 23: "For what time period(s)

17   were direct observations of ISC operations

18   conducted?"

19   Periodically between May of 2001 to March

20   testify 2002.

21   Onto AT&T, question number 1. This first

22   question refers to the inclusion of provision

23   billing. In fact the MPP was changed in February,

24   2002, to transfer billing support to 24.10.

25   Provisioning support at ISCs is still

1   covered in this particular test. So we didn't

2   discharge it, it was moved to the appropriate area.

3   2: "Please clarify whether the HEET

4   database can be queried to obtain the status of any

5   ASR (order), or clarify that it only contains orders

6   that have been marked as delayed by Qwest."

7   The answer is HEET can only be used to

8   check the status for delayed orders.

9   Question 3: "Given that HP is not

10   scheduled to publish the section of the Discrete Test

11   Report until April 13, 2002, how was it that 'KPMG

12   also collected and analyzed findings from HPC?"

13   We monitored HPC's observations and

14   exceptions throughout the course of the test and we

15   regularly consulted and interviewed with HPC

16   personnel and incorporated their findings into this

17   report up to and including the very recent -- we have

18   just had a spilled drink.

19   (Laughter.)

20   MS. ANDERSON: We draw the line at

21   physical abuse.

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 4. Same

23   answer.

24   5: "Please describe what, if any,

25   information was contained from CLEC interviews on the

1   CLEC's experience as to whether or not Qwest was

2   following Interconnect Service Center processes"....

3   We will have the similar conceptual

4   understanding about whether or not a CLEC or HPC

5   would be able to determine if Qwest were adhering to

6   its processes.

7   However, the CLECs who responded to KPMG

8   Consulting's request for info were generally

9   satisfied with their experience and they noted no

10   major issues with ISC.

11   This data was used as one data source of

12   many for KPMG in determining the testing and

13   subsequent retesting activities that we needed to

14   conduct.

15   MS. OLIVER: Follow-up question similar to

16   what I had before.

17   How many CLECs provided feedback?

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: It's the same.

19   MR. WEEKS: Same ones.

20   MS. OLIVER: Thank you.

21   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question number 6 from

22   AT&T asks: Did KPMG Consulting -- "Please explain

23   why KPMG Consulting considered this particular

24   Evaluation Criteria 'Satisfied' and why the issues

25   described in the open HPC exceptions do not prevent

1   KPMG from assigning a Satisfied result to this

2   evaluation criterion."

3   We did make note of and were monitoring

4   HPC's findings throughout the course of the test.

5   And these were that group of exceptions known as the

6   disorderly orders.

7   We subsequently raised our own related

8   observations and exceptions and retested those

9   appropriately.

10   There is a second point though that I

11   would like to make. That is that HPC in its role as

12   PCLEC will typically raise observations and

13   exceptions on an individual transaction level basis

14   where they do one of something and, if it works,

15   great, and if it doesn't work, they will issue an

16   observation or Exception.

17   However, KPMG Consulting in its role will

18   look at aggregated performance over a course of time.

19   And in many of these cases there were not, there was

20   not sufficient evidence for us to continue to pursue

21   any individual finding that HPC had uncovered.

22   Finally, the reports that we have released

23   to date have not been the final reports, and,

24   therefore, things are subject to change, should

25   conditions warrant that we do additional work or

1   change what we have presented to date.

2   Number 7: This is the same, same response

3   that I have just given to number 6 in that taken in

4   total, this issue did not merit further attention by

5   KPMG.

6   Question 8: "Please describe what, if

7   any, information was obtained from CLEC interviews on

8   the CLEC's experience as to whether or not Qwest was

9   following Interconnect Service Center processes

10   including policy, procedures, roles and objectives."

11   We believe that this is a duplicate

12   question from number 5, in that we had several CLECs

13   respond that they seemed to be satisfied with the

14   process.

15   So on to number 9: "KPMG Consulting

16   states, quote, 'If a SDC handling an LSR is unable to

17   assist the CLEC with an issue, the caller is

18   'warm-transferred' to the appropriate ISC. The

19   ownership of the issue is also transferred and

20   customer-specific information is verified by the new

21   SDC handling the issue. Does verification of

22   'customer specific information' by 'the new SDC

23   handling the issue' mean the CLEC must provide to the

24   second SDC the same information it already provided

25   to the first SDC?"

1   The answer is no. The SDC confirms the

2   identity and issue in question only.

3   This has been clarified in the new version

4   or latest version.

5   The second follow-up question to that is

6   no longer applicable.

7   The third, "Is information entered into

8   the Call Center Tracking Database by the Tier 0 SDC

9   immediately available to the Tier 1 SDC if the call

10   is 'warm-transferred?'"

11   The answer is yes.

12   Question 10: "Provide KPMG Consulting's

13   understanding of the ISC management objectives for

14   performance measurements related to ISC operations.

15   To what extent is the management tier provided with

16   incentives to meet or exceed specific performance

17   measurement results?"

18   We are not aware nor did we evaluate any

19   incentive plans in place by the company, particularly

20   in the ISC.

21   Similarly we read the question to mean the

22   ISC management objectives of performance measures

23   rather than performance measures. And the

24   performance objectives that were indicated to us

25   during Qwest management interviews was quality of

 1   service for the CLEC customer base.

 2   Question 11 --

 3   MR. CONNOLLY: Excuse me, you said you

 4   didn't look beyond the fact that there are specific

 5   sets of objectives as to what are the behaviors that

 6   go to attempting to achieve those objectives.

 7   MR. WEEKS: I think we interpreted the

 8   question to be asking about the objective of the

 9   performance measures and we were answering we think

10   the objective of the performance measures, taken as a

11   whole, is customer service. We interpreted the

12   question that way rather than interpreting the

13   question to asking us for a list of the individual

14   performance measures.

15   Because that is -- some of that is

16   documented in the report. And then we didn't look at

17   any comp plans or anything like that. It would have

18   been tied to whether the center or individuals in the

19   center accomplished targets or goals or objectives.

20   MR. CONNOLLY: There are standards for the

21   performance measures in the ISCs. The internal ones

22   that drive --

23   MR. WEEKS: I know there are quality

24   targets. Yes, there are internal targets for the

25   different performance measures --

```
 1              MR. CONNOLLY:  Means the same thing to me.

 2              MR. WEEKS:  Okay.

 3              MR. CONNOLLY:  The manager strives to

 4   achieve those targets or standards.

 5              MR. WEEKS:  One would think.

 6              MR. CONNOLLY:  What is the incentive to do

 7   that.

 8              MR. WEEKS:  We don't know whether they get

 9   paid bonuses or not, whether they are fired or

10   penalized if they don't achieve -- we didn't look

11   into the comp plans so we don't know what kind of

12   compensation impact there is, if any, for failure or

13   success in meeting goals or objectives.

14              MR. CONNOLLY:  No one was flogged at the

15   stake or anything like that.

16              MR. WEEKS:  We didn't see that, not in our

17   presence.

18              MS. ANDERSON:  Would Qwest like to comment

19   on that?

20              (Laughter.)

21              MR. WEEKS:  Flogging will continue until

22   morale improves.

23              MR. FINNEGAN:  There are going to be a lot

24   of floggings, then.

25              MR. DELLA TORRE:  Question 11:  "Are
```

1   Service Performance Results Reports those that are

2   published monthly to reflect Qwest's performance

3   against the PIDs?"

4   We removed this reference in our report.

5   The answer is yes.

6   12: "Provide KPMG Consulting's

7   understanding of any differences in work rules

8   established by the ISCs versus retail order

9   processing centers where those result from collective

10   bargaining agreements."

11   We did not do any assessment of the terms

12   and conditions in collective bargaining agreements or

13   parity with wholesale, between retail and wholesale.

14   Other questions on 24.8?

15   MS. ANDERSON: Okay. In keeping with the

16   ROC's incentive plan for performance, we are now five

17   minutes ahead, so we can take a five-minute break.

18   (Recess.)

19   MS. ANDERSON: We are going to get

20   started. That includes you, Dick. You can't be

21   chitchatting those press people.

22   MR. WEEKS: He has to be listening to get

23   the criticism.

24   MR. DELLA TORRE: We can get started on

25   24.10.

1   Test 24.10 - ISC/Billing and Collection

2   Center Support Review

3   MR. WEEKS: 24.10. The last one that you

4   have available to you is dated April 9. We have 11

5   SATs and one unable.

6   We are going to start with, going back and

7   forth, so it's AT&T's turn first.

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: I will try to move

9   rather quickly. Jump right in. Don't be afraid to

10   cut me off.

11   Question number 1: "Did the pseudo CLEC

12   make any calls to the ISC Billing and Collection

13   Center? If so how were the Pseudo-CLEC's experiences

14   captured and incorporated into the findings and

15   conclusions for Test 24.10?"

16   In point of fact, KPMG Consulting acted as

17   the Pseudo-CLEC in this test. In case there was any

18   misunderstanding that we used the same name, which

19   probably wasn't the best thing.

20   But it was the concept of the Pseudo-CLEC.

21   It was just that it was KPMG Consulting personnel

22   that did place calls.

23   So the answer is yes, that we did place

24   calls.

25   But it was actually in relation to test 20

1   from the billing test.

2   MR. WEEKS: When we had questions or

3   problems or issues that arose as a result of things

4   we saw during bill validation, that generated calls.

5   MR. DELLA TORRE: I think there are a

6   series of questions around this, so we can describe

7   it a little bit more.

8   The distinction we commonly refer to

9   between the transaction testing and process testing,

10   black box, white box, what-not, here, as is the case

11   with audit management, we do have a white box

12   analysis of the support center review. Those are the

13   processes that were evaluated.

14   So the calls are not placed as part of

15   that white box process evaluation. In fact, calling,

16   not unlike order submission or the bills themselves

17   or trouble tickets, those are all transaction-type

18   activities. Any subsequent calls that may be

19   required for clarification on your bills, your

20   trouble tickets or your orders and pre-orders are

21   then therefore part of the transaction, which is why

22   HPC, in the order management world, get the Help Desk

23   calls which is why our Help Desk calls here are

24   related more to Test 20 and truly Test 24.10,

25   although there was clearly a relationship between

1   them.

2   I think that that may address in whole or

3   in part the first three questions. But let me ask if

4   there are follow-ups before we just move beyond

5   those?

6   MR. FINNEGAN: Just so I understand, the

7   issue is you really need to look at both? The Test

8   20 and Test 24.10?

9   MR. DELLA TORRE: The -- yes, that is a

10   correct statement. So the strict answer to your

11   question is yes. You need to look at both.

12   But I do want to be fair in disclosing

13   Test 20 now, these were a limited number of calls

14   based on our need to call based on the bills we

15   received and questions that we had on those bills.

16   MR. WEEKS: It wasn't a bunch of

17   artificial scripted make up pretend calls. They were

18   real calls about real problems on real bills.

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: As was the case in order

20   management. The volume of calls required to be made

21   in order management were much higher because the

22   questions that we had around the order processing

23   were much higher.

24   Other questions on that sort of concept in

25   general? Okay. We will move on to question number

1   4:   "The test report refers to a 'tracking

2   spreadsheet that lists the status of all customer

3   requests.'   Are these spreadsheets readily accessible

4   to all SDCs or are they separately maintained by

5   individual SDCs?

6   Answer: They are separately maintained by

7   individuals.

8   MR. FINNEGAN: Are there CLEC specific

9   SDCs?

10   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes, there are.

11   MR. FINNEGAN: Is that a team approach, or

12 is there an individual with perhaps a backup?

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: Okay.   The individual

14 SDCs are aligned by product.   There are groups,

15 though, overseen by a coach who can also acted as the

16 backup across both CLECs and products with a group of

17 SDCs.

18   MR. FINNEGAN: I guess what I am getting

19 at with this is --

20   MR. WEEKS: Sure.   You want to know if

21 spreadsheets can get shared.

22   MR. FINNEGAN: Yes.

23   MR. WEEKS: Given they are owned by

24 individuals.

25   MR. FINNEGAN: And would Joe Della Torre

1   know that Mike Weeks had files on AT&T's billing

2   issues?

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: The answer, our best

4   understanding is that the alignments are across

5   products at the Coach level. And, therefore, not

6   distinguished by the CLEC as much. So the Coach who

7   would aggregate that information would see

8   commonalities or look at the reports across CLECs by

9   product rather than the individual SDC who is a CLEC.

10   MR. WEEKS: I think the question was going

11   in the opposite direction. I am the SDC that handles

12   AT&T. I am sick today. There is spreadsheets and

13   all this sort of stuff. Who has access to those?

14   How do they find them? How do they know where they

15   are? That sort of thing.

16   MR. DELLA TORRE: The SDC is backed by the

17   Coach.

18   MR. FINNEGAN: So the quote was talking

19   about customer requests. So if I have an unbundeled

20   loop request, I am AT&T, there is going to be an SDC

21   that is aligned by service that will deal with my

22   unbundeled loop, they will maintain a spreadsheet, if

23   another day I had an issue on UNE-P, there might be a

24   different SDC that deals with UNE-P issues --

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: That's correct.

1   Question 5 is very similar, discussing the

2   folders that are maintained by SDCs that contain the

3   requests. This is also separately maintained by the

4   individual SDCs and backed by the Coaches.

5   So question 6: "KPMG Consulting

6   identified that Qwest process is to 'acknowledge

7   requests within 10 days of receipt.' Please indicate

8   using KPMG Consulting's professional judgment and

9   experience in other tests whether a 10 -day interval

10 to acknowledge a request is long, short, or typical."

11   We do not offer any opinion on this

12 10-day, being long, short or typical.

13   MR. FINNEGAN: To acknowledge, it's, hey,

14 we got your question?

15   MR. WEEKS: As opposed to committing to

16 having an answer back within ten days.

17   MR. FINNEGAN: Is there --

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: That is also to

19 encompass request claims. Yes. Is that right?

20   Okay. Requests and claims.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: That seems like a long time

22 just to say we've got it.

23   MR. WEEKS: If that is your advocacy case,

24 I think you should make it.

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 7, similar

1   question, but discussing the resolution of a claim.

2   It's a 30-day period.

3   Again, we don't offer a position on

4   whether this is a long, short or typical period of

5   time.

6   Finally, "What is KPMG Consulting's

7   professional opinion on whether or not a standard for

8   resolving non-complex claims within 30 days would be

9   considered timely?"

10   We offer no position.

11   MR. FINNEGAN: Is there any reason why?

12   MR. WEEKS: It just wasn't part of the

13   evaluation of the test. In general what we try not

14   to do is go through offering, spreading gratuitously,

15   opinions about things like this.

16   What we try to do is test what is there,

17   report on what is there. Just historically have not

18   often jumped into -- for example, PIDs.

19   There are a lot of PIDs sitting out there.

20   If you asked our professional opinion, we would tell

21   you we think they are silly. It's not our place to

22   do that. It's been through due process. It is what

23   it is, we audit to it, we describe, we report. We

24   are not here to second-guess all of that.

25   MR. FINNEGAN: The PID example is somewhat

1   different.

2   MR. WEEKS: Agreed.

3   MR. FINNEGAN: Here there is some element

4   of the adequacy of the process rather than just is it

5   documented and are they following it. And I think

6   it's relevant if KPMG has experience it obtained

7   through other tests to offer an opinion.

8   MR. WEEKS: Right. But it wasn't an

9   activity of the test to do that. What I am saying,

10 if you want to ask me that question on a witness

11 stand in a hearing, I would be happy to answer that

12 question.

13   But in terms of a report of fact, it

14 doesn't really belong, because it would be just a

15 professional opinion, not a finding, not an

16 observation or Exception or anything else.

17   MS. ANDERSON: This is Denise Anderson.

18   Would it be appropriate to have a

19 follow-up question that was more along the lines that

20 you could research an answer later that would say in

21 other testing jurisdictions what were the similar

22 time frames to this?

23   MR. WEEKS: We could do that. You could

24 do that as well. These folks do business all across

25 the United States. I am sure they have ready access

1   to that information the same way we do.

2   MS. ANDERSON: Good point. Yes.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question 9: "Is this

4   document an internal Qwest document or is it

5   available to the CLECs?"

6   The answer is it is another internal

7   document.

8   Follow-on question: "If it is an internal

9   Qwest document, please identify how Qwest

10   communicates its 30-day resolution to CLECs."

11   The answer is, it is a written

12   acknowledgment.

13   10: This was actually, we believe this

14   was a mistake. We have corrected the web site

15   reference. This is in the revised April 9 version of

16   this report.

17   Question 11: "Please identify and

18   describe the performance objectives that Qwest uses

19   for resolving customer disputes and answering of

20   customer questions."

21   And the dispute, objective that we just

22   discussed was the 30 days, and we are not aware of a

23   performance objective for answering customer

24   questions.

25   Other questions on AT&T's section?

1   Moving to WorldCom.

2   Question 1: "Please verify, KPMG makes no

3   determination of the adequacy of the responses

4   provided by Qwest."

5   That is a correct statement.

6   Question number 2: "Is there a

7   distinction between the two call centers that is

8   relevant to CLECs?"

9   The answer is no.

10   Question 3: "Are the billing SDCs the

11   same resources used to work pre-order and order

12   inquiries for CLECs?"

13   The answer is also no.

14   Question 4: "What are the documented

15   procedures Qwest employs to handle the different

16   contact methods described above?", which are

17   toll-free number, e-mail, U.S. Mail and fax.

18   There is really distinction to be made

19   here. We are not aware of any MMPs for the actual

20   retrieval process of going and getting the fax or

21   opening the e-mail or answering the phone.

22   However, if the question was intended to

23   mean the actual handling of the disputes, then they

24   do not in fact differ, based on the submission

25   manner.

```
 1          Question 5:  "Did KPMG conduct on-site

 2   inspections at both Billing Support Center

 3   locations?"

 4          The answer is yes.

 5          6:  "Did KPMG consult, conduct interviews

 6   with Qwest POCs in both Billing Support Center

 7   locations?"

 8          Answer is yes.

 9          7:  "Did KPMG witness" --

10          MS. OLIVER:  Excuse me.  Becky Oliver,

11   WorldCom.

12          Follow-up question.  I guess it applies to

13   both questions 5 and 6.

14          Did KPMG observe any differences between

15   the Billing Support Center locations?

16          MR. DELLA TORRE:  No, we did not.

17          MS. OLIVER:  Thank you.

18          MR. DELLA TORRE:  Question 7:  "Did KPMG

19   witness adherence to scope of responsibilities?"

20          We did witness adherence to the credits

21   and adjustments responsibilities, the escalation

22   procedures, billing dispute management

23   responsibilities and general inquiries

24   responsibilities.

25          Additionally, resends of past period bills
```

 1   requested from Qwest via the ISC were received in the

 2   course of Test 20.

 3   So I guess another way to put that in

 4   summary is that we did examine artifacts of these

 5   processes having been adhered to.

 6   Question 8: The 10-day reference,

 7   "calendar or business days?"

 8   And the answer is those are business days.

 9   And I believe 10 days is the maximum, and it's

10   actually a window of anywhere from three to ten days.

11   Question 9: Context, "A dispute

12   maintenance conversation (DISM) database, used to

13   track disputes. The question is, "Please clarify if

14   'disputes' is the same as CLEC claims."

15   And the answer is yes.

16   Question 10: "Qwest processes exist for

17   resolving inquiries and claims in a timely manner.

18   What evidence did KPMG utilize to make such a

19   conclusion statement?"

20   The process was examined using document

21   dispute and wholesale procedures documentation

22   available to the SDCs.

23   The processes for resolving customer

24   inquiries are included as part of the billing SDC's

25   training materials detailing customer contact

1   guidelines and various tools available to billing

2   SDCs to investigate inquiries.

3   KPMG also reviewed artifacts of these,

4   rather supporting documentation for IFs and

5   historical claims, that is reviewed with Billing

6   Support Center personnel.

7   Finally, KPMG Consulting placed a limited

8   number of inquiries to the Collection Center and,

9   Bill and Collection Center and the responses to these

10   inquiries were both timely and accurate.

11   Question 11: Also a calendar or business

12   days on the 30-day claim resolution. And we believe

13   that these are calendar days, but we would ask if

14   Qwest is able to provide confirmation of if, in fact,

15   they are calendar or business days.

16   MS. LUBAMERSKY: We will do that. Nancy

17   Lubamersky from Qwest.

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: 12: "When is the CLEC

19   notified that a claim cannot be resolved within 30

20   days, and when is a new commitment date for its

21   disposition is provided?"

22   For IF disputes, if a dispute requires

23   more than 39 business days to investigate the CLEC

24   will be notified, but no fixed date is given for when

25   a new or no fixed date, rather, is given for when a

1 new commitment date will be provided to a CLEC.

2   CRIS disputes, dispute wholesale

3 procedures indicate the CLEC is notified prior to the

4 initial 30-day investigation if more than 30 days is

5 required. Again, no fixed date is given.

6   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

7   I didn't follow the second half of the

8 response. You said for CRIS disputes the CLEC is

9 notified in advance of the investigation, that it's

10 getting under way if it's going to take longer than

11 30 days?

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: The CLEC will be

13 notified if more than 30 days is required.

14   MS. OLIVER: This is getting to the

15 investigation is under way and at some point in that

16 process Qwest realizes this is going to take longer

17 than we originally thought.

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: We are not aware of a

19 specific date within the 30-day period the CLEC is

20 given notification.

21   MS. OLIVER: Did I understand that the

22 process also doesn't allow for when a delay is

23 identified, that a new target resolution date is

24 provided but doesn't happen?

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: That's correct.

1   MS. OLIVER: Was there a reason for that ?

2   MS. LUBAMERSKY: My understanding is that

3   the methods do not require a new commitment be given

4   because in most cases when it goes beyond 30 days

5   it's treated on an ICD basis.

6   If it is a point of delay, it is known how

7   much longer it will take, that commitment is given

8   and regular follow-up occurs from that SDC back to

9   the CLEC until resolution.

10   MR. DELLA TORRE: Other follow-up, Becky?

11   MS. OLIVER: No, thank you.

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: 13: "Who is responsible

13   for monitoring accuracy of pending claims in the

14   Wholesale Division Status Report?

15   The answer is team leaders and Coaches.

16   Question 14: "Upon closure, reviews of

17   each case are obtained by a Coach, Team Leader or the

18   Director. Did KPMG Consulting witness any such

19   reviews?"

20   The answer is no.

21   15: "Did KPMG Consulting make any

22   assessment as to the timeliness of sending resolution

23   letters to CLECs?"

24   The answer is no.

25   16: "The inquiring customer is called or

1   E-mailed to ensure that he or she is aware of the

2   claim's final resolution. Please verify, KPMG

3   confirmed adherence to this procedure."

4   We did examine e-mails. We did not

5   observe calls being made.

6   17: "Did KPMG conduct on site visits at

7   both Billing Support Center locations?"

8   The answer is yes.

9   18: We reference historical data and the

10   question is, "How were the referenced historical

11   claims selected to be reviewed?"

12   KPMG Consulting submitted a data request

13   specifying the historical claim information to review

14   with Qwest personnel as per the established data

15   request process in the ROC TAG at the beginning of

16   the task.

17   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

18   Was there any process for randomly

19   selecting these historical records or claims, or was

20   that up to Qwest to choose which ones based on the

21   data requests they received?

22   MR. DELLA TORRE: Our data request was

23   made for a period of time, I believe.

24   (Pause.)

25   MR. DELLA TORRE: We specified the type of

1   claim -- sorry. Historical claims. We specified the

2   type we were looking for, but we did not actually

3   oversee the selection of those times by Qwest.

4   Question 19: "Please clarify, no claims

5   can be initiated by calling the toll-free number

6   shown on its bill?"

7   That is correct.

8   20: "Does Qwest employ methods to sync up

9   information being tracked via the 'notes' section of

10   the CRIS or the IABS user interface with that of the

11   claim tracking spreadsheet?"

12   We are not aware of any explicit methods.

13   These are both done by the SDCs.

14   Question 21: "What is/are the source(s)

15   utilized by Qwest to capture information in the above

16   two reports? Specifically, the Product-specific

17   Carrier Billing and Collection Report and the

18   Wholesale Service Delivery Results - Trending

19   Report?"

20   These reports are collected by the Coaches

21   and Team Leaders from SDC claims and disputes

22   processing information.

23   Question 22: "What are the performance

24   objectives?"

25   I believe we answered this in AT&T

1   question number 11, that it's 30 days for resolution

2   and no specific performance objective in answering

3   the customer question.

4   Question 23: "What methods are in place

5   to ensure that when deficiencies in performance are

6   identified, they are also addressed?"

7   And our criteria for this particular area,

8   performance measures are defined, measured and

9   reviewed. We did observe all of those happening.

10   But I am not sure if we went to the level

11   that you seem to be asking in this question. Could

12   you clarify your question?

13   MS. OLIVER: Becky Oliver, WorldCom.

14   This question is just getting to an MMP

15   that may be in place by Qwest to follow up and

16   actually implement improvements --

17   MR. WEEKS: Let me ask the question

18   differently.

19   Are you asking us do the MMPs contain

20   steps to sort of make sure that once a problem or

21   issue has been identified that there is something

22   downstream in the process, some checklist or

23   check-off or something that says this particular

24   issue has been addressed from a process perspective?

25   That none of the problems have been raised

1   and then let fall on the floor? Is that --

2   MS. OLIVER: Essentially.

3   MR. WEEKS: -- essentially right?

4   MR. DELLA TORRE: We did observe the

5   behavior that you are discussing. But we are not

6   aware of the specific citation in an MMP.

7   MS. OLIVER: Okay.

8   MR. DELLA TORRE: Question, 24: "What

9   source information is used by Qwest's Learning

10   Council to identify and prioritize the development of

11   training needs and relevant courses?"

12   First just as a point of fact, the Qwest

13   Learning Council has been supplanted by the Wholesale

14   Market Training Group, which has assumed

15   responsibility for developing training plans.

16   And the identification you have training

17   needs and relevant courses are determined using input

18   from the Coaches within the ISC Billing and

19   Collection Center.

20   The Coaches appraise the performance of

21   SDCs and provide input on the training needs of the

22   SDCs that they manage within their team to the

23   wholesale market training group.

24   And question number 25: "What events

25   would require that Qwest initiate these process

1   actions?"

2   The process being referred to is KPMG

3   Consulting was able to verify the existence of

4   Qwest's process.

5   However, since this process is performed

6   only when events require such actions to be taken,

7   and KPMG Consulting observed none of those such

8   events, KPMG Consulting was unable to observe and

9   determine whether or not Qwest adheres to these

10   processes.

11   This is one of the conditions where we

12   have published "unable to determine," and refer to

13   these essentially as event driven activities where

14   that particular event did not occur for one reason or

15   another. In this specific case the events that would

16   be required are the training classes or meetings of

17   the training staff to discuss the training

18   development issues.

19   And one of those I believe occurred after

20   the conclusion of our testing activities in this test

21   section.

22   (Pause.)

23   MR. DELLA TORRE: So that this group we

24   referred to earlier, Wholesale Market Training Group,

25   met at the end of January. We had already concluded

1   our work at that point.

2   MS. OLIVER: All right.

3   MR. DELLA TORRE: Other questions on Test

4   24.10?

5   MR. SPINKS: Tom Spinks, Washington. Is

6   there a dispute escalation process?

7   MR. DELLA TORRE: A dispute escalation

8   process.

9   MR. SPINKS: In other words --

10   MR. WEEKS: We understand the question.

11   (Pause.)

12   MR. DELLA TORRE: Apparently, individual

13   interconnection agreements can have the dispute

14   escalation built into it.

15   Other questions?

16   MR. FINNEGAN: Follow-up to that last

17   WorldCom question. Test has been going on for quite

18   some time.

19   Was that answer limited to training

20   subsequent to the Qwest Wholesale Market Training

21   Group?

22   MR. WEEKS: Are you asking whether our

23   results predate the warping of one organization to

24   the other?

25   MR. FINNEGAN: The question was generally

1   a question of training of representatives.

2   MR. WEEKS: Maybe we misunderstood the

3   question. We were focused not on the training of

4   people. We were focused on the process of, I think

5   the process being described there isn't the actual

6   day-in, day-out training, it's something to do with

7   the training design or development process.

8   MS. ANDERSON: Characteristic lump

9   development.

10   MR. WEEKS: Characteristic lump

11   development and so on. Which doesn't happen

12   frequently.

13   In fact, we found out about this meeting

14   where they had a characteristic lump or planning

15   meeting that occurred after, this was anecdotal

16   information that didn't have any bearing on the

17   results of the report.

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: Other questions? Thank

19   you.

20   MR. WEEKS: Are we going to try to --

21   MS. ANDERSON: Yes. One of my concerns is

22   that we currently have transcription. If we go to a

23   conference call we will have to do recordings, all of

24   that. I would like to take whatever advantage of

25   this that we can.

1   If we can have a list of the questions for

2   follow-up, then someone can read that or give a copy,

3   both, if we could give one to Craig, that would be

4   great.

5   (Pause.)

6   MS. ANDERSON: Okay, then just read them.

7   What we will do is Joe will read the follow-up

8   question from BTC number 1. And then give the

9   answer.

10   MR. DELLA TORRE: This may be a bit

11   disjointed, because it's going to be very out of

12   context. Let's see if we can make it through this.

13   These are follow-up questions from the

14   first Vendor Technical Conference and the first test

15   we will talk about is Test 12.7. The question, "Do

16   retail reps have access to the raw loop data tool?"

17   Answer is no.

18   12.7-1 details the detail loop raw process

19   which shows FNS. However, Figure 12.7-2 shows FNS

20   and ISA and FNS EA. Describe the differences, if

21   any, that exist between the two process descriptions.

22   I believe we did go into this detail at

23   the VTC, so we can strike that from here.

24   Test 14.7 is our next reference. The

25   question was, "What are the conditions for no

1 facilities? What are remedial options? Is there a

2 difference between retail and wholesale as to how a

3 no facilities order is processed?

4   The answer is through a documentation

5 request, supplied information which describes the

6 condition under which request will reject the CLEC's

7 order or Qwest order due to lack of facilities.

8   KPMG learned there were no differences

9 between the processing of retail and wholesale

10 non-facilities orders.

11   And then the other question --

12   MR. FINNEGAN: Follow-up. This concern we

13 got around to, CLEC orders would be canceled if it

14 turned out there were no facilities available.

15   Does that mean Qwest will cancel retail

16 orders if they determine no facilities available?

17 That you examined process documentation that showed

18 cancellation of retail orders where there were no

19 facilities available?

20   MR. DELLA TORRE: We will have to follow

21 up on that. We don't have the personnel to assist us

22 in answering that.

23   MR. WEEKS: Unless Qwest wants to take a

24 stab at it.

25   A VOICE: I am sorry.

1   MS. LUBAMERSKY: I don't know.

2   MR. WEEKS: We will have to find out. We

3 don't know.

4   MR. DELLA TORRE: And the last question in

5 test 14.7, "What is the prioritization mechanism for

6 K2?"

7   Answer is the prioritization mechanisms

8 for K2 are reflected in business rules embedded in

9 the system. These are contained in the K2 program

10 document.

11   MR. WEEKS: So the answer is we don't

12 know.

13   MR. DELLA TORRE: We are aware they are,

14 we know what the rules are.

15   MS. ANDERSON: So you will be following

16 up?

17   MR. WEEKS: Yes.

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: For test 14.8. "Did

19 KPMG validate the trigger where LNP cuts had been

20 set?"

21   The answer is no.

22   "Has KPMG checked to ensure the hard cut

23 was a good cut, the validating trigger was set?"

24   The answer is no.

25   Question. "What evidence did KPMG see to

1   conclude orders or work according to RAD date from

2   earliest to latest without regard to retail or

3   wholesale initiation?

4   We observed representatives actually work

5   orders according to RAD date from earliest to latest

6   without regard to retail or wholesale initiation, so

7   observation of field personnel.

8   MR. FINNEGAN: Could I go back to the

9   previous question. This was on the HOT-TOT (phon.)

10   and PID defines a completed order as one in which

11   associated porting activity has been completed?

12   MR. WEEKS: Right. The reason we didn't

13   observe it, because it's done in the RCMAC, not the

14   field tech in the field. It's not in the MMPs we

15   were evaluating adherence to. A technical answer to

16   why we didn't do it.

17   MR. FINNEGAN: So it's done but it's not

18   something observed or referenced in a Qwest document?

19   MR. DELLA TORRE: RCMAC MMPs.

20   MR. WEEKS: We were evaluating adherence

21   to a set of MMPs used by the tech field personnel.

22   There is a set of RCMAC MMPs I would suggest, the

23   guys aren't here so I can't confirm this, RCMAC MMPs

24   that describe how that is supposed to happen and so

25   on wasn't part of the evaluation we were doing for

 1   the MMPs that were oriented around the field tech.

 2   MR. FINNEGAN: Wasn't that task number --

 3   I forget the task number, dealt with coordinated

 4   processes generically?

 5   MR. WEEKS: This is 14.8. I would have to

 6   look at what the definition of 14.8 is.

 7   The question is did we observe it. The

 8   answer is no.

 9   Should we have done it is a second

10   question.

11   MR. FINNEGAN: It's not when did you

12   observe it. If there is Qwest documentation that

13   exists, it's something you could review since you

14   have access to the documentation. At this point it

15   may be too late to observe them in practice. At

16   least from a documentation perspective, was there in

17   this coordinated process MMPs in place --

18   MR. DELLA TORRE: Yes.

19   MR. WEEKS: The answer to that is yes.

20   Our folks are referring to specific RCMAC MMPs.

21   MR. FINNEGAN: So there are MMPs that --

22   MR. WEEKS: Describe how to do the set of

23   triggers and so on.

24   MR. FINNEGAN: Well ensure the trigger has

25   been set --

1   MR. WEEKS: As part of one of the steps.

2   MR. FINNEGAN: You just didn't observe the

3   practice.

4   MR. WEEKS: We just didn't observe it.

5   MR. FINNEGAN: Okay.

6   MR. DELLA TORRE: The question again in

7   test 14.8 references Page 8. "What audits and

8   controls are in place to ensure CLECs are notified of

9   delayed orders within four hours?"

10   And the audit and controls that are in the

11   TURK system time stamp notes are made in the GC note

12   screen by GC personnel and DR we received for the

13   process flow explains that the DOTG will pull this

14   from RTT the first thing each morning and at least

15   every four hours throughout the day to find new

16   orders and within four hours of the RTT ticket

17   issuance will call the SRN, all market units except

18   wholesale, inform the SRN of the delayed order so

19   contact can be made to the customer and document this

20   contact with a GC note.

21   The wholesale monitoring group does not

22   require a call when the R2 ticket is issued, however

23   GC note must still be updated.

24   So those are some of the audit and control

25   measures around CLEC notification in the TURK system.

1   That is the completion of the follow-up

2   questions with two that still need to be followed up

3   a second time.

4   MS. ANDERSON: Great. Thanks for doing

5   that.

6   Any other questions or issues before we

7   break?

8   I would like to, at this time, thank the

9   vendors, KPMG's team and all their support folks for

10 the preparation, as well as HP's team and their

11 support folks. We appreciate all the time and effort

12 that goes into having answers well-prepared and being

13 able to deliver them and take the follow-ups. So

14 thanks everybody for attendance.

15   The next and final VTC will be VTC number

16 3, scheduled for May 14 to 16, and we will be putting

17 out a schedule for question submittal probably

18 tomorrow. We just want to get past the project

19 managers meeting and take sure where we are at on

20 everything, then we will get the schedule out.

21   I do have one announcement I think. Is it

22 firm that Test 16 will not be a discrete and will be

23 in the final report or are we still expecting-

24   MR. DELLA TORRE: Should have the final on

25 Friday.

1   MS. ANDERSON: Okay. So those of you

2   waiting with extreme bated breath for Test 16, it

3   will be arriving with the draft final report on

4   Friday.

5   Any other questions or comments?

6   Thank you, Marie, for all of the

7   arrangements. I think this was our best acoustics so

8   far.

9   (Applause.)

10   MS. ANDERSON: And thanks to the bridge.

11   We are going to hang up now.

12   (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED -- 2:30 P.M.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25