

1 BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
2 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

3 In the Matter of the)
4 Investigation into)
5 U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'s) Docket No. UT-003022
6) Volume LVI
7 Compliance with Section 271 of) Pages 7828 to 7876
8 the Telecommunications Act of)
9 1996)
10 -----)
11 In the Matter of)
12 U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'s) Docket No. UT-003040
13 Statement of Generally) Volume LVI
14 Available Terms Pursuant to) Pages 7828 to 7876
15 Section 252(f) of the)
16 Telecommunications Act of 1996)
17 _____)

14 A pre-hearing conference in the above matters
15 was held on June 4, 2002, at 9:30 a.m., at 1300 South
16 Evergreen Park Drive Southwest, Room 206, Olympia,
17 Washington, before Administrative Law Judge ANN RENDAHL.

18 The parties were present as follows:

19 QWEST CORPORATION, by LISA ANDERL, Attorney
20 at Law, 1600 Seventh Avenue, Suite 3206, Seattle,
21 Washington 98191, Telephone (206) 345-1574, Fax (206)
22 343-4040, E-Mail landerl@qwest.com; and via bridge line
23 by ANDREW CRAIN, Attorney at Law, 1801 California
24 Street, Suite 4900, Denver, Colorado 80202, Telephone
25 (303) 672-2734, Fax (303) 295-7069, E-mail
acrain@qwest.com

24 Joan E. Kinn, CCR, RPR
25 Court Reporter

1 THE PUBLIC, via bridge line, by ROBERT W.
2 CROMWELL, JR., Assistant Attorney General, 900 Fourth
3 Avenue, Suite 2000, Seattle, Washington, 98164-1012,
Telephone (206) 464-6595, Fax (206) 389-2058, E-Mail
robertc1@atg.wa.gov.

4 WORLDCOM, INC., via bridge line, by MICHEL
5 SINGER-NELSON, Attorney at Law, 707 - 17th Street, Suite
4200, Denver, Colorado 80202, Telephone (303) 390-6106,
Fax (303) 390-6333, E-mail
6 michel.singer nelson@wcom.com; and by DAVID L. RICE,
7 Attorney at Law, Miller Nash LLP, 601 Union Street,
Suite 4400, Seattle, Washington 98101, Telephone (206)
777-7406, Fax (206) 622-7485, E-mail
8 rice@millernash.com.

9 AT&T, via bridge line by MARY B. TRIBBY and
10 STEVEN WEIGLER, Attorneys at Law, 1875 Lawrence Street,
Suite 1575, Denver, Colorado 80202, Telephone (303)
298-6508, Fax (303) 298-6301, E-mail
11 mtribby@lga.att.com.

12 COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, via bridge line
13 by MEGAN DOBERNECK, Attorney at Law, 7901 Lowry
Boulevard, Denver, Colorado 80230, Telephone (720)
208-3636, Fax (720) 208-3256, E-mail mdoberne@covad.com.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7830

1 -----

2 INDEX OF EXHIBITS

3 -----

4 EXHIBIT: MARKED: ADMITTED:

5 QWEST (No witness)

6 1680 7864

7 1681 7864

8 1682 7864

9 1683 7864

10 1684 7864

11 1685 7864

12 1686 7864

13 JOINT CLECS (No witness)

14 1689 7866

15 1690 7867

16 1691 7867

17 WEEKS, DELLATORRE (KPMG)

18 1697 7868

19 1698 7868

20 1699 7868

21 MAY, GRAGERT, PETRY (HP)

22 1702 7868

23 FINNEGAN (AT&T)

24 1705 7868

25 1706 7868

7831

1	1707	7868
2	1708	7868
3	1709	7868
4	OLIVER (WorldCom)	
5	1715	7869
6	1716	7869
7	1717	7869
8	1718	7869
9	JUDITH M. SCHULTZ, LYNN NOTARIANNI,	
10	AND CHRISTOPHER J. VIVEROS (QWEST)	
11	1721	7869
12	1722	7869
13	1723	7869
14	1724	7869
15	1725	7869
16	1726	7869
17	1727	7870
18	1728	7870
19	1729	7870
20	1730	7870
21	1731	7870
22	1732	7870
23	1733	7870
24	1734	7870
25	1735	7870

7832

1	1736	7870
2	1737	7870
3	1738	7870
4	1739	7870
5	1740	7870
6	1741	7870
7	1742	7871
8	1743	7871
9	1744	7871
10	1745	7871
11	1746	7871
12	1747	7871
13	1748	7871
14	1749	7871
15	1750	7871
16	1751	7871
17	1752	7871
18	1753	7871
19	1754	7872
20	1755	7872
21	1756	7872
22	1757	7872
23	1758	7872
24	1759	7872
25	1760	7872

7833

1	1761	7872
2	1762	7872
3	1763	7872
4	1764	7872
5	1765	7872
6	1766	7872
7	1767	7873
8	1768	7873
9	1769	7873
10	1770	7873
11	1771	7873
12	1772	7873
13	1773	7873
14	1774	7873
15	1775	7873
16	1776	7873
17	1777-C	7873
18	1778-C	7873
19	1779-C	7874
20	1780-C	7874
21	1781	7874
22	1782	7874
23	1783-C	7874
24	1784	7874
25	1785	7874

7834

1	1786	7874
2	1787	7874
3	1788	7874
4	1789	7875
5	1790	7875
6	1791	7875
7	1792	7875
8	1793	7875
9	1794	7875

10

11	Records Requisition 7	7839
----	-----------------------	------

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2 JUDGE RENDAHL: Good morning, everyone.

3 We're here once again before the Washington Utilities
4 and Transportation Commission this morning, June 4th,
5 2002, for a pre-hearing conference in Docket Numbers
6 UT-003022 and 003040, the investigation into U S West's,
7 now Qwest's, compliance with Section 271 of the
8 Telecommunications Act of 1996 and Qwest's Statement of
9 Generally Available Terms pursuant to Section 252(f) of
10 the Act. I'm Ann Rendahl, the Administrative Law Judge
11 presiding over this pre-hearing conference.

12 The purpose of our pre-hearing this morning
13 is to prepare for the hearing scheduled to begin
14 tomorrow and continue Thursday and Friday of this week.
15 In particular, we need to schedule when topics will be
16 presented during the hearing and identify times for
17 cross. Given the estimates that everyone has submitted,
18 we need to revisit that, otherwise we will be here
19 through Sunday.

20 If you have previously appeared, we're going
21 to take appearances, and I think everyone has already
22 appeared, so why don't you just state your name and the
23 party you represent when we go through appearances.

24 I have several preliminary issues we will
25 need to talk about. One is the 34th Supplemental Order

7836

1 provides a June 11th compliance filing date, and I need
2 to set a date for responsive comments. Also, Covad has
3 filed a motion to admit the Response to Records
4 Requisition Number 7. Ms. Anderl has one preliminary
5 issue she would like to discuss in terms of the 90 day
6 requirement the Commission has imposed before Qwest
7 files.

8 Are there any other preliminary issues we
9 need to talk about after we take appearances?

10 Hearing nothing, let's take appearances
11 beginning with Qwest here in the room, and then after we
12 go through those present in the room, we'll go to the
13 bridge line.

14 MS. ANDERL: Lisa Anderl representing Qwest.

15 JUDGE RENDAHL: Thank you.

16 MR. RICE: David Rice representing WorldCom.

17 JUDGE RENDAHL: Can everyone on the bridge
18 hear Mr. Rice?

19 Okay, you need to make sure the mike is on
20 and put it next to your mouth.

21 Okay, on the bridge line starting with AT&T.

22 MS. TRIBBY: This is Mary Tribby for AT&T.

23 MR. WEIGLER: Steve Weigler for AT&T.

24 JUDGE RENDAHL: And WorldCom.

25 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Michel Singer-Nelson on

7837

1 behalf of WorldCom.

2 JUDGE RENDAHL: Covad.

3 MS. DOBERNECK: Megan Doberneck on behalf of
4 Covad Communications Company.

5 JUDGE RENDAHL: Public Counsel.

6 MR. CROMWELL: Robert Cromwell on behalf of
7 Public Counsel.

8 JUDGE RENDAHL: And Qwest.

9 MR. CRAIN: Andy Crain on behalf of Qwest.

10 JUDGE RENDAHL: And I know we also have Lynn
11 Notarianni on the line and Teresa Jensen; are you both
12 still there?

13 MS. JENSEN: Yes.

14 MS. NOTARIANNI: Yes.

15 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, thank you.

16 Let's go first to the preliminary issues.

17 The Commission entered its 34th Supplemental Order on
18 the outstanding compliance issues and established a June
19 11th compliance filing date for various issues noted in
20 the order. Would the parties, any party who is
21 interested in commenting on whatever Qwest files, would
22 you make -- let's be off the record for a moment.

23 (Discussion off the record.)

24 JUDGE RENDAHL: Would June 18th be an
25 acceptable response filing date for the parties?

7838

1 MS. SINGER-NELSON: That's not a problem with
2 WorldCom.

3 MS. DOBERNECK: That's fine, Your Honor, for
4 Covad.

5 JUDGE RENDAHL: For Covad, okay.

6 And AT&T?

7 MS. TRIBBY: That's fine with us as well,
8 Your Honor.

9 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

10 Mr. Cromwell, would you be planning on
11 commenting at all on that?

12 MR. CROMWELL: I really can't say without
13 seeing it. I would not anticipate comments unless there
14 were some significant discrepancy between the compliance
15 filing and what the Commission had ordered to be filed.

16 JUDGE RENDAHL: And would that date be
17 acceptable if you were going to file comments?

18 MR. CROMWELL: The 17th?

19 JUDGE RENDAHL: The 18th.

20 MR. CROMWELL: I'm sorry, yeah.

21 JUDGE RENDAHL: And unless there's a true
22 need on Qwest's part to reply, I'm not, given the
23 timing, I'm not going to set a date for reply comments,
24 and this will all be addressed on a paper record. We
25 won't need another further compliance hearing. This

7839

1 week's hearings are the last set of hearings in this
2 proceeding. At least at this point that's all we have
3 planned.

4 And then I note that Covad filed a motion to
5 admit the response to Records Requisition Number 7. Is
6 there any opposition to that motion?

7 MS. ANDERL: No.

8 JUDGE RENDAHL: Ms. Anderl says no.

9 Anyone on the bridge line?

10 Okay, hearing nothing, we will admit it. I
11 need to take a look at the exhibit list. I will send
12 out a notice advising the parties what the number is for
13 that exhibit.

14 And then, Ms. Anderl, would you like to
15 address the 90 day issue.

16 MS. ANDERL: Well, Your Honor, I wanted to
17 raise that this may be something we would like to raise
18 while the commissioners are on the Bench either
19 Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, unless you would like us
20 to make our argument and presentation now, but we would
21 just like to raise the issue of the 90 day requirement
22 that the Commission originally imposed in the first
23 interpretive policy statement that kind of established
24 the ground rules for the proceeding. And we had
25 previously discussed this issue and asked the Commission

7840

1 to either do away with the requirement or determine that
2 the proceedings to date had satisfied the requirement,
3 and I believe the Commission's ruling was something
4 along the lines of it's too soon to say that at this
5 point. And so now that we're much further down the road
6 and we have very few unresolved issues, we would like to
7 raise it again and have the Commission specifically
8 address that there's not a need to file with the
9 Commission the entire -- our FCC filing 90 days in
10 advance, which is what I believe the requirement states.

11 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, well, I think, as I
12 think about it, I think it's more appropriate to have
13 this argued to the commissioners. I'm sure now that
14 other parties are now on notice that Qwest would like to
15 raise the issue, and maybe when we're setting the
16 schedule for the hearing we'll designate a certain
17 period of time, not extensive, for the parties to make
18 their arguments on this issue. Is that acceptable?

19 MS. TRIBBY: Fine with AT&T, Your Honor.

20 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, so we'll set a specific
21 time during the hearing.

22 Mr. Rice or Ms. Singer-Nelson, is that
23 acceptable?

24 MS. SINGER-NELSON: That's fine, Judge, yes.

25 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. Not having heard any

7841

1 objections, we'll go ahead with that.

2 Okay, well, let's talk about scheduling now,
3 and given that Colorado is having its hearing next week,
4 we have three full days to conduct our hearing.

5 However, tomorrow morning we are addressing QPAP issues,
6 and so we really only have two and a half days for OSS
7 issues.

8 Let's first talk about the QPAP issues. I
9 will be circulating to all of you via E-mail after this
10 pre-hearing a matrix of compliance issues. I apologize
11 for not having circulated it prior. It identifies the
12 issues, the requirements from the 30th and the 33rd
13 Supplemental Orders and where Qwest has indicated its
14 compliance and then included comments by Public Counsel
15 and the joint CLECs on those issues. And given that the
16 comments came in yesterday, that's why I didn't get it
17 to you, and it won't get to you until today.

18 But the issues that at least I have
19 identified that we will need to discuss are the issue of
20 the revenue cap language, the ARMIS, the date of the
21 ARMIS data, the tier 2 payment trigger, collocation
22 payments, service quality payments, special access
23 circuits, adding new UNEs, changes to measure weighting,
24 six month review, Section 16, the special fund,
25 multistate audits and investigation, payment method.

7842

1 And then the only other issue would be the issue of
2 consistency with the SGAT, which we had deferred that
3 issue until now as the appropriate time.

4 Those are 13 issues, 13 discreet issues, and
5 the time we have for tomorrow morning, if you take out
6 the break time and the preliminary time, we have about
7 two hours of time, so it's 120 minutes. We've got
8 approximately 12, 13 issues just on QPAP, so that
9 doesn't even include any SGAT issues that there might
10 be. There are 2 discreet issues from the SGAT that was
11 just filed, and I'm not finding them right now, my
12 apologies, but it looks to me on some of those issues we
13 may need to restrict comments to just a couple of
14 minutes. On some, we may need to have a longer period
15 of time.

16 And if the parties can this afternoon if
17 there are any issues that they don't feel need to be
18 discussed that they can agree upon language and maybe
19 that that's possible, and then we can cut that down. If
20 not, then we will probably on some of the issues like
21 the 6 month review, the 3 issues that Qwest has
22 identified in its compliance filing we may need to spend
23 more time on, and the others we may need to spend less
24 time on. So I'm just giving you fair warning that
25 that's what the agenda will pretty much be like tomorrow

7843

1 morning. Does that work for everyone?

2 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Yes.

3 MR. CRAIN: Works for me.

4 MR. CROMWELL: This is Robert Cromwell, Your
5 Honor. I guess I wasn't entirely clear from a
6 procedural standpoint what the Commission had
7 envisioned. Is tomorrow an opportunity for in essence
8 oral argument or presentation of testimony and cross
9 examination on these issues?

10 JUDGE RENDAHL: I'm not anticipating
11 testimony. This is a compliance filing discussion
12 similar to some of the other -- I don't know if you have
13 been present, Mr. Cromwell, for some of the other SGAT
14 compliance oral arguments where we have had -- we have
15 basically identified issues that parties have raised
16 with Qwest's compliance with the SGAT and allowed each
17 party to address those issues very briefly, in a sense
18 giving the Commission oral argument on why the issue is
19 or is not compliant with the Commission's orders to
20 allow us to issue an order on compliance.

21 MR. CROMWELL: All right, so then the scope
22 is as to Qwest's compliance filing, degree of compliance
23 with the Commission's orders?

24 JUDGE RENDAHL: Correct.

25 MR. CROMWELL: Thank you.

7844

1 JUDGE RENDAHL: Correct. Okay, so that's the
2 compliance issues.

3 And then starting at 1:30 after lunch, we
4 will begin with the OSS final report discussion, and I'm
5 anticipating taking the vendors first. MTG will be
6 here, Marie Bakunas, several representatives from KPMG
7 and several from Hewlett-Packard, and I'm anticipating
8 taking each of those vendors up separately, because they
9 each have a discreet role in the process, and I think
10 there may be discreet questions for each vendor. As I
11 noted via an E-mail communication to all of you, MTG has
12 anticipated 15 minutes of a direct presentation, KPMG
13 has estimated 45 minutes max, and HP 15 minutes. Now
14 the estimates I have, from Qwest I have an estimate of
15 one hour per vendor, and I'm wondering if that might be
16 able to be scaled down.

17 MS. ANDERL: And let me just say, Mr. Crain,
18 because I wasn't able to talk with you directly, that
19 was my best understanding. If you meant one hour for
20 all three --

21 MR. CRAIN: I meant one hour for all three.

22 JUDGE RENDAHL: That's great.

23 MR. CRAIN: Unless you want me to go an hour.

24 JUDGE RENDAHL: No, I really don't.

25 MR. CRAIN: I don't need to.

7845

1 MS. ANDERL: That's what I thought, but I
2 thought I better err on the conservative side.

3 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. And then I understood
4 WorldCom to say an estimate of 2 hours total for all
5 vendors, so what I did was I estimated 30 minutes for
6 MTG, an hour for KPMG, and 30 minutes for HP. Now if
7 you can lower those estimates, I would be very happy.

8 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Judge, this is Michel
9 Singer-Nelson, I think WorldCom probably could lower the
10 estimates to an hour for the vendors.

11 JUDGE RENDAHL: So 20 minutes per vendor?

12 MS. SINGER-NELSON: I would rather have an
13 hour overall. I don't know if it's going to be cut to
14 20 minutes per vendor.

15 JUDGE RENDAHL: I tell you what I will do, I
16 will put 20 minutes per vendor and then allocate the
17 time, if you don't use it, then you can have it for
18 another vendor. Does that work for you?

19 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Yep.

20 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

21 Now Covad I think had estimated an hour
22 overall; is that correct?

23 MS. DOBERNECK: Yes.

24 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. So again, I think what
25 I did was I did 15, half an hour, and 15, so the most

7846

1 time for KPMG. Is that what you would prefer?

2 MS. DOBERNECK: Yeah, I think that's fine. I
3 think like Michel stated, you know, there may be some
4 fudging, but I think that's probably a very good
5 framework to work with. And if I don't need it, then it
6 can just go to a general time fund.

7 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, well, we will work with
8 this then.

9 And then AT&T had designated an hour just for
10 KPMG and HP; is that correct?

11 MS. TRIBBY: Yes, and I think we can probably
12 lower ours to an hour total as well.

13 JUDGE RENDAHL: Well, I think that's what I
14 had understood you to say. I sort of assigned a half an
15 hour to KPMG and half an hour to HP.

16 MS. TRIBBY: Okay, I wasn't sure what we had
17 finally said on that, but that's fine.

18 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, well, I think we
19 have --

20 MS. TRIBBY: Recognizing, Your Honor, that we
21 may spend more of that time with one vendor than the
22 other.

23 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

24 MS. DOBERNECK: Your Honor, this is Megan
25 Doberneck, actually, it just occurred to me you stated

7847

1 that you had reserved some cross time for MTG, and I
2 don't think I will have anything for MTG.

3 JUDGE RENDAHL: Oh, okay.

4 MS. TRIBBY: And, Your Honor, I understand
5 from what you're saying that Liberty Consulting will not
6 be in attendance?

7 JUDGE RENDAHL: Correct.

8 MS. TRIBBY: So we have concluded with them
9 at the last hearing; is that your sense?

10 JUDGE RENDAHL: Well, my understanding was
11 that there weren't any data reconciliation issues or
12 auditing issues as a part of this process. And also
13 Mr. Center when I was coordinating with him indicated
14 that Mr. Stright would not be here.

15 MS. TRIBBY: There is some ongoing work that
16 Liberty is doing, but I think our sense is that we,
17 because all the reports were out by the time we did our
18 last hearing, you know, we may comment on some of the
19 issues in our testimony or our comments, but we're fine
20 with not having them appear.

21 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

22 Well, it looks like we would finish with MTG
23 at the very latest before our afternoon break, and then
24 we'll start with KPMG.

25 MR. CRAIN: And I think MTG may go even

7848

1 faster than that.

2 JUDGE RENDAHL: Well, that's fine, and I just
3 think we ought to estimate on the higher side rather
4 than the lower just to be sure what we've got here. So
5 bear with me while I just run through this quickly.

6 Okay, and it looks like with all the
7 estimates we will probably be done with KPMG by the end
8 of the day on Wednesday, meaning that we would start --
9 so we have already gained a half a day, thank you all
10 very much, and we would start in the morning with HP.
11 And if we go faster, that's wonderful, I just want to
12 make sure that we estimate enough time. So we would
13 start at 9:30 with HP, and we would probably be done by
14 11:30 with all the -- if the estimates are true, and
15 then we would begin with Qwest's presentation. Now
16 going to and assuming -- I will just block this out, and
17 if we go quicker, we go quicker, and that's just fine.

18 Ms. Anderl.

19 MS. ANDERL: Your Honor, when you're building
20 these time estimates, are you building in time for
21 commissioners' questions?

22 JUDGE RENDAHL: Oh, thank you, I had earlier,
23 and I didn't. Well, we will be done approximately
24 noonish then. Thank you.

25 MS. ANDERL: Sure.

7849

1 JUDGE RENDAHL: So then starting essentially
2 after lunch on Thursday, we would begin -- now I'm
3 assuming we would begin with Qwest's presentation, or do
4 we want to begin with the CLECs? I'm not -- and I raise
5 this because I'm -- you all are closer to these issues
6 than I am, you may have gone through these discussions
7 in other states, what works best?

8 MR. CRAIN: This is Andy Crain from Qwest,
9 and to avoid a situation where we put on people and then
10 possibly put on any rebuttal, we would suggest that the
11 CLECs go first and then Qwest after that.

12 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

13 Who has joined us on the bridge?

14 A mystery guest, okay.

15 Any comments from AT&T?

16 MS. TRIBBY: Well, Your Honor, yeah. I'm not
17 sure, Andy, how you intend to do your comments in
18 Washington, whether you are going to do an overview like
19 you did in Nebraska or whether your witnesses will be
20 doing the overview.

21 MR. CRAIN: We would suggest that we would do
22 a panel discussion with the three witnesses giving a
23 short presentation and then fielding questions.

24 MS. TRIBBY: Well, I understand not wanting
25 to call witnesses twice. I guess the concern that I

7850

1 have is that Qwest tends to present, at least they did
2 yesterday and I assume their witness was based on their
3 pre-filed comments, will present sort of an overview of
4 the tests in terms of what the criteria were, how they
5 were satisfied, that kind of thing. Our comments really
6 are responsive to those comments. So however you want
7 to do it, Your Honor. I mean we have some comments on
8 the tests generally, but we don't go through sort of an
9 overview of the tests and the findings of the tests. We
10 typically -- Qwest has done that, and then we have done
11 more our analysis of the test and sort of a response to
12 the things that Qwest has said.

13 MR. CRAIN: And we anticipate actually doing
14 less of that than we did in other places, because I
15 anticipate that the vendors will be doing that and that
16 the parties will be addressing more specific issues.

17 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. But, Mr. Crain, your
18 proposal is to have Qwest go first, then have AT&T and
19 WorldCom go next, and then any possible rebuttal?

20 MR. CRAIN: Well, either that -- to avoid the
21 rebuttal issue, I was suggesting that the CLECs go first
22 and then Qwest go after that.

23 MS. TRIBBY: And, Your Honor, I'm okay with
24 that as long as the Commission is okay with sort of the
25 flow of that process, recognizing that, you know, there

7851

1 may be some gaps in knowledge which might require some
2 of the CLEC witnesses that go early on to provide some
3 of that, if asked.

4 JUDGE RENDAHL: And I think that's fine. I
5 think it might flow better to have Qwest give a response
6 instead of having Qwest witnesses go and then have to
7 come back for rebuttal.

8 Okay, so why don't we take up AT&T's, well,
9 between AT&T and WorldCom, who prefers to go first, or
10 have you resolved this in another forum?

11 MS. SINGER-NELSON: If Mary doesn't mind, I
12 would prefer that AT&T goes first.

13 MS. TRIBBY: That's fine with us.

14 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. So starting after
15 lunch on Thursday, we will begin with Mr. Finnegan. Now
16 I understand from the time estimate that he has a 30
17 minute overview, and Qwest has estimated an hour of
18 cross; is that correct?

19 MS. TRIBBY: Your Honor, if that's what we
20 said, that was a mistake.

21 JUDGE RENDAHL: All right, how much overview
22 do you need?

23 MS. TRIBBY: Well, I guess this is also
24 something that, you know, Andy and I could have tried to
25 discuss off line. My sense, and I sense from Qwest

7852

1 estimates as well, my sense is that because this is the
2 report of the vendors, there's probably going to be less
3 cross. Andy, I don't know if you agree with this, but
4 my sense is that there will be less cross of each
5 other's witnesses than there is of the vendors. And I
6 guess having said that, I would prefer that we spend the
7 majority of our time with Mr. Finnegan and Qwest
8 witnesses, if that's what they prefer, giving their
9 opinion on the test. Because at this point, that's
10 really what it is, is sort of varying views on the
11 tests. So I would like to have an hour to an hour and a
12 half for Mr. Finnegan's direct presentation.

13 MR. CRAIN: And that's okay with me. I still
14 would estimate an hour of cross. I might not use all of
15 that, but that's a conservative estimate.

16 JUDGE RENDAHL: All right. Well, why don't
17 we for now, Ms. Tribby, I'm going to start with an hour
18 for Mr. Finnegan and an hour of cross for Qwest. That
19 brings us to 3:45 p.m. on Thursday afternoon. I'm just
20 giving you sort of a running sense of where we are. I'm
21 going to ask the commissioners if they're willing to go
22 late one evening. I don't know what their schedules
23 are, but we do have limited time, and so as I said
24 before, we're going to have to cut back, and we may have
25 to.

7853

1 Okay, and then, Ms. Singer-Nelson, I have an
2 estimate for you of 30 minutes for Ms. Oliver and then
3 an hour of cross for Qwest. Is that a correct estimate?

4 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Yes, I would say that we
5 could probably go a little shorter in the cross for
6 Qwest.

7 MR. CRAIN: Yeah, and I think I would say cut
8 that down to 30 minutes of cross for Qwest.

9 Has WorldCom submitted comments?

10 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Yes.

11 MR. CRAIN: I don't think I have seen them.

12 JUDGE RENDAHL: I think they were circulated
13 by E-mail last night. They're present hard copy in the
14 room today. I received them by E-mail last night.
15 They're joint CLEC comments, I guess it's Covad,
16 WorldCom, and --

17 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Just Covad and WorldCom.

18 JUDGE RENDAHL: Covad and WorldCom.

19 MS. SINGER-NELSON: And then WorldCom joins
20 in AT&T's comments as well.

21 MR. CRAIN: Could someone resend those to me,
22 please?

23 MS. ANDERL: We will, Andy, when we're back
24 in the office.

25 MR. CRAIN: Okay, I just thought maybe

7854

1 something was on the --

2 MS. ANDERL: I was going to say unless Covad
3 can just shoot you a copy.

4 MS. TRIBBY: Your Honor, the other thing is
5 if Qwest intends to present their witnesses as a panel,
6 I think we had estimated an hour or less per witness. I
7 mean certainly I would see that being an hour or less
8 for the collective whole.

9 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, well, let's now, we
10 have essentially finished the day on Thursday.

11 MS. TRIBBY: Well, can I interrupt a second,
12 I mean is -- am I going -- is Mr. Finnegan going to be
13 able to go over his hour?

14 JUDGE RENDAHL: I don't know, and that's what
15 I'm trying to find out. I think what we need to do is
16 kind of based on the estimates we have now, let's work
17 it through, see where we are.

18 MS. TRIBBY: Okay.

19 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

20 MS. SINGER-NELSON: And the other thing is,
21 Judge, I wanted to suggest that if AT&T needs more time,
22 I think some of our comments are duplicative of AT&T,
23 and WorldCom would be willing to coordinate with AT&T to
24 see if they could have more of our time, and maybe
25 Ms. Oliver can just stand for questions.

7855

1 JUDGE RENDAHL: Well, we will take that up as
2 we get there. As I have now, we have spent -- we have
3 allocated a day for the vendors that goes from the
4 afternoon, Wednesday afternoon through Thursday morning.
5 We begin in the afternoon on Thursday with AT&T and
6 WorldCom's witnesses, leaving Friday for the panel for
7 Qwest. I have no problem with a panel if the panel
8 witnesses are not discussing discreet issues. It
9 occurred to me from the change management panel that we
10 had, each witness had discreet issues that could have
11 been addressed separately, and I think we lost a bit
12 there. And so I'm concerned that we impanel a group and
13 then they each have a different focus. That's the only
14 concern I have.

15 Mr. Crain, can you speak to how
16 Ms. Notarianni, Mr. Viveros, and I assume Ms. Filip are
17 going to address their issues?

18 MR. CRAIN: They are somewhat discreet and
19 somewhat overlapped. Ms. Notarianni will focus mainly
20 on the traditional OSS systems issues. Mr. Viveros will
21 focus on the sort of CLEC support and assistance issues.
22 And Judy Schultz would be focusing on the issues of
23 change management. So my hesitation comes from just a
24 little -- from the possibility of overlap in those
25 issues. For example, a lot of the CLEC support in the

7856

1 change management issues overlap as to change management
2 and the test environment issues that Lynn Notarianni
3 would be handling.

4 What I wanted to avoid by doing the panel
5 issue is having people ask questions that we would not
6 necessarily be immediately -- or where we would have
7 somebody on, and then once that person got off the
8 stand, somebody asks a question of the next person and
9 have the answer be, well, you should have asked Lynn
10 that question. And that's what I wanted to avoid. I
11 wanted us to be able to answer and respond to every
12 question without that kind of problem because of there
13 being some overlap here.

14 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, well, we may want to --
15 I will need to think about this, but let's assume for
16 right now that they are separate witnesses. Qwest had
17 estimated two hours of presentation time for direct.

18 MR. CRAIN: And I would say Lynn Notarianni,
19 and these are very conservative estimates, Lynn
20 Notarianni having 45 minutes to an hour and half an hour
21 each for Mr. Viveros and for the change management
22 piece.

23 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. Now is Dana Filip
24 going to be here, or is Ms. Schultz going to be here?

25 MR. CRAIN: It looks like it will be Dana

7857

1 Filip.

2 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

3 MS. TRIBBY: Your Honor, I have a question.

4 I realize that there are some final findings with
5 respect to CMP and SATE in the final report, but I
6 thought the Commission had already held hearings on CMP.

7 MR. CRAIN: And to respond to that, we wanted
8 to be as responsive as possible here in case people had
9 questions or issues on that. We do consider those
10 issues to be fully presented and briefed, and if the
11 Commission does not want to hear those issues at all
12 this week, we're fine with that.

13 JUDGE RENDAHL: Well, I guess to the extent
14 that the change management issues are -- there is a
15 final report on change management. I think that the
16 focus on change management should be on those two tests,
17 the final results in those two tests and whatever else
18 the parties have done on change management that -- I
19 mean in a sense when we finished the hearing on change
20 management, there were several outstanding issues in my
21 understanding, and so I am not intending to allow anyone
22 to rehash old ground but to inform the Commission of
23 where we are now on change management. Would that work
24 for the parties?

25 MR. CRAIN: That works with us, and we will

7858

1 limit any discussion or comments to anything that has
2 changed since that last hearing. And in that case, it
3 may be fairly short.

4 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

5 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Judge, this is Michel
6 Singer-Nelson, I think WorldCom does intend to address
7 change management, so I would like the opportunity to
8 discuss that at this hearing.

9 JUDGE RENDAHL: And are you willing to limit
10 your discussion to anything that has changed since the
11 April hearing?

12 MS. SINGER-NELSON: I think to -- I think we
13 can limit it to make sure that we don't duplicate what
14 we have already said, and then also we would address the
15 final report discussion of it.

16 JUDGE RENDAHL: Right, because there were
17 process, you know, the redesign process was not yet
18 complete it's my understanding.

19 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Right.

20 JUDGE RENDAHL: And so there is some further
21 discussion on that that may need to take place and the
22 discussion of the final report and any other closure
23 issues on change management. But I do not want any
24 witness or attorney to go over old ground. We don't
25 have time for that, and I don't think it's appropriate

7859

1 to rehash it.

2 MS. SINGER-NELSON: I understand.

3 MR. CRAIN: We understand that as well.

4 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. So if we take
5 Ms. Notarianni separately, you estimate at max an hour
6 of direct for her, correct?

7 MR. CRAIN: That's correct.

8 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay and WorldCom's
9 estimates, I think you had said two hours to cross
10 examine Qwest witnesses. Was that assuming they would
11 be a part of a panel?

12 MS. SINGER-NELSON: It wasn't really assuming
13 any particular format, but I think we could cut that in
14 half.

15 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. So if you took 20
16 minutes for Ms. Notarianni or allocate your time within
17 an hour for all three witnesses?

18 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Yes.

19 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. Then what I may do, as
20 I did before, is just allocate 20 minutes per witness
21 and understanding you may use some of that time later.

22 MS. SINGER-NELSON: That works.

23 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. All right, and then
24 AT&T, my understanding was an hour per witness, but you
25 have said if this is a panel, you may not need an hour

7860

1 per witness. Would the same hold if you did not have
2 them as a panel?

3 MS. TRIBBY: Yeah, I think we can probably do
4 an hour total for all three.

5 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. Again, I will do the
6 same that I did for WorldCom, allocate 20 minutes per
7 witness, and if you need more or less, we will adjust it
8 during the hearing just for time purposes.

9 And then Covad, Ms. Doberneck, I think you
10 had estimated an hour for Qwest witnesses; is that still
11 correct?

12 MS. DOBERNECK: It is, although I think it
13 will likely be less, you know, given Qwest's examination
14 by other parties, so I can -- actually, why don't I just
15 knock it down to 45 minutes right now.

16 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

17 MS. DOBERNECK: And again, it will probably
18 be less than that.

19 JUDGE RENDAHL: Now am I missing anyone else
20 in their time estimates?

21 Okay, let me just run this through. If we
22 start at 9:30, after Ms. Notarianni's presentation, we
23 take a break. Now I assume we will start with AT&T,
24 then WorldCom, then Covad; is that the acceptable order?

25 MS. TRIBBY: That's fine, Your Honor.

7861

1 MS. SINGER-NELSON: That's fine.

2 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, so we would be
3 finishing approximately noonish with Ms. Notarianni and
4 approximately at 3:00 with Mr. Viveros. We could take a
5 break. And now you had estimated about 30 minutes for
6 Ms. Filip, but with the further discussion on change
7 management, would that estimate go down, Mr. Crain?

8 MR. CRAIN: I would hope we would be able to
9 get that done then in 15 minutes.

10 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

11 MR. CRAIN: And I guess one more further
12 clarification, we did address already the draft final
13 report in our last workshop.

14 JUDGE RENDAHL: Correct.

15 MR. CRAIN: We only intend to address those
16 things that changed between the draft final and the
17 final final.

18 JUDGE RENDAHL: Right.

19 MR. CRAIN: Okay, then 15 minutes.

20 JUDGE RENDAHL: Well, I think with those,
21 assuming we do not have a panel, we would definitely
22 finish by about 5:30 on Friday. I'm going to assume we
23 will be going until about 5:30 each day. It looks like
24 it's doable with the revisions you all have made.

25 Now going back to you, Ms. Tribby, is that

7862

1 going to work? You had thought about having more time,
2 and I have given you an hour for Mr. Finnegan with an
3 hour of cross time. Now to the extent that, as
4 Ms. Singer-Nelson said, working, you all are, you know,
5 if you need to talk amongst one another about
6 readjusting the time for Mr. Finnegan and Ms. Oliver,
7 there's an hour and a half of direct time and an hour
8 and a half of cross time from Qwest for those two
9 witnesses. To the extent Mr. Crain, Ms. Tribby, and
10 Ms. Singer-Nelson you all want to reevaluate those times
11 and rework them, that's fine with me.

12 MS. TRIBBY: Your Honor, that will be okay.
13 I think Mr. Finnegan is going to be the main witness on
14 the CLEC side.

15 JUDGE RENDAHL: Right.

16 MS. TRIBBY: And Qwest has, you know, two
17 hours probably of direct examination, and it may be
18 depending on where we are, you know, I may ask just
19 based on what happened in the performance workshop for
20 Mr. Finnegan to be able to go an hour and a half on his
21 direct as opposed to an hour, or if we are crunched for
22 time and we haven't been able to get it from other
23 parties, maybe give up some of my cross time in order to
24 allow him more direct, but I would, depending on where
25 we are, I would like that flexibility.

7863

1 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. Well, what I will do
2 is I will also ask the commissioners if there is one day
3 in which they are willing to go late if we need to
4 expand the time at all. Does that work?

5 MS. TRIBBY: Yes, it does for AT&T. I
6 appreciate that.

7 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, so that's what we'll
8 do, and so essentially the way it works out is we are
9 doing the compliance issues Wednesday morning, vendors,
10 MTG and KPMG, on the afternoon. Start with HP Thursday
11 morning, go to CLEC witnesses on Thursday afternoon, and
12 address Qwest witnesses on Friday. And so that's where
13 the schedule stands right now, and I appreciate your
14 willingness, all of you, your willingness to readjust
15 your time estimates.

16 Okay, let's go talk about exhibits. Maybe we
17 can finish this up. Shall we take a break, or do you
18 want to just keep going? What do you want to do?

19 MS. ANDERL: I'm fine to keep going.

20 JUDGE RENDAHL: All right, let's plod ahead.

21 Okay, I received exhibit lists from Qwest,
22 AT&T, and WorldCom, and since we're going to be
23 addressing the QPAP issues first, I am going to take
24 Qwest's QPAP and compliance exhibits first, then the
25 joint CLEC comments, and then Public Counsel had filed

7864

1 comments, so that's where I'm starting first. So if you
2 need to get your pages out.

3 I will start numbering with Exhibit 1680 with
4 Qwest's QPAP compliance filing that was filed on May
5 28th. Exhibit A or Attachment A to that was the
6 performance assurance plan, and that will be 1681. Then
7 there was an attachment, the post entry performance plan
8 final collaborative summary by MTG and NRRI dated June
9 5th, 2001, that will be 1682. And then also on May 28th
10 Qwest filed an updated SGAT, so the notice of updated
11 statement will be 1683. Then the SGAT, the 6th Revision
12 with the exhibits is 1684. And then the redlined
13 version is 1685.

14 Now, Ms. Anderl, you had circulated
15 electronically a compliance matrix. Do you want that to
16 be an exhibit, or do you want it just to be a useful
17 reference document?

18 MS. ANDERL: I think we would just go ahead
19 and have it marked as an exhibit.

20 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, so that will be 1686.

21 MS. ANDERL: And there are hard copies in the
22 room.

23 JUDGE RENDAHL: Ms. Anderl is saying there
24 are hard copies in the room for those of you who can't
25 hear, and so they were circulated by E-mail, and it's on

7865

1 the side table, and it will be there tomorrow morning
2 for those of you who come in tomorrow.

3 Now there was some discussion also via E-mail
4 yesterday about errata to the QPAP, and is that going to
5 be an exhibit or not at this point?

6 MS. ANDERL: Not at this point.

7 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

8 MS. ANDERL: We decided not to prepare one
9 because we were reasonably certain that other commas and
10 parentheses and semicolons would be found that needed to
11 be corrected, and so we would just as soon do it all at
12 once.

13 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay.

14 Do any of the parties have any cross
15 examination exhibits? I guess there's no witnesses, so
16 there's not really any cross exam, but are there any
17 exhibits other than those filed in the joint comments?

18 MS. SINGER-NELSON: Not from WorldCom.

19 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, well, we will leave a
20 space anyway just in case.

21 MR. CROMWELL: Your Honor, Robert Cromwell,
22 in my comments I cited to an Iowa commission order that
23 was recently issued. I had not anticipated submitting a
24 copy, but if it is convenient for you for me to do so, I
25 can do that. It is available on the Iowa Web site.

7866

1 JUDGE RENDAHL: Mr. Weigler, is that one that
2 AT&T submitted as a supplemental statement of authority?

3 Is Mr. Weigler still there?

4 MS. TRIBBY: Your Honor, he must have dropped
5 off.

6 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay. We have received
7 numerous supplemental statements of authority from AT&T
8 with all of the various orders. I'm assuming they were
9 filed here. You might coordinate with him,
10 Mr. Cromwell. If not, then either one of you can submit
11 it as a supplemental statement of authority, but I'm not
12 sure it needs to be an exhibit.

13 MR. CROMWELL: That's fine.

14 JUDGE RENDAHL: So beginning with the joint
15 CLECs, we would have as 1689 the joint comments that
16 were filed yesterday. Attachment A to those comments is
17 a -- now is that an excerpt from the Colorado plan, or
18 is that from the -- you can see how closely I have
19 looked at these all, is that a Washington plan excerpt
20 or a Colorado plan excerpt?

21 MS. DOBERNECK: That's a good question.

22 MS. TRIBBY: I know Mr. Weigler put that
23 attachment on the document, and since he's not here, let
24 me look at it, and maybe I can --

25 JUDGE RENDAHL: We can always --

7867

1 MS. TRIBBY: Your Honor, it was North Dakota,
2 I believe.

3 JUDGE RENDAHL: Okay, thank you, so I will
4 refer to that in the description. That Attachment A is
5 1690. And then 1691 is Attachment B, the data for
6 Washington from ARMIS, A-R-M-I-S, 43-01, year 2001.

7 Now, Mr. Cromwell, do you want your comments
8 as a pleading, or should they be an exhibit? I didn't
9 note any language proposals in there.

10 MR. CROMWELL: I had simply considered them
11 as pleadings, but if you prefer them as an exhibit, that
12 would be fine.

13 JUDGE RENDAHL: I have included pleadings
14 where they have language suggestions. And in this case,
15 it didn't, so I think we will just leave it as a
16 pleading.

17 MR. CROMWELL: That's fine.

18 Your Honor, are we off the record?

19 JUDGE RENDAHL: We are on the record.

20 MR. CROMWELL: Oh.

21 JUDGE RENDAHL: We can go off the record.

22 Let's be off the record.

23 (Discussion off the record.)

24

25 (The following exhibits were identified in

7868

1 conjunction with WEEKS, DELLATORRE (KPMG).)

2 Exhibit 1697 is Qwest Communications OSS
3 Evaluation, Final Report, Version 2.0, KPMG Consulting,
4 5/28/02. Exhibit 1698 is Revision Log, Final Report
5 2.0, 5/28/02. Exhibit 1699 is Qwest Manual Order Entry
6 Performance Indicator Description Adequacy Study, KPMG
7 Consulting, 4/30/02.

8

9 (The following exhibits were identified in
10 conjunction with MAY, GRAGERT, PETRY (HP).)

11 Exhibit 1702 is ROC 271 HP Discrete Reports -
12 Final Editions, Hewlett-Packard, 5/29/02.

13

14 (The following exhibits were identified in
15 conjunction with FINNEGAN (AT&T).)

16 Exhibit 1705 is AT&T's Response to Qwest's
17 Summary of Closed/Unresolved Observations and Exceptions
18 in the ROC OSS Test, filed 5/20/02. Exhibit 1706 is
19 AT&T's Update Regarding O& Es for CMP and Remarks
20 Regarding PO-16 Concerning CMP, filed 5/20/02. Exhibit
21 1707 is Ex. A - Exception 3110 - KPMG Consulting's Third
22 Response, dated 5/8/02. Exhibit 1708 is Ex. B - Excerpt
23 from AT&T Comments to Performance Measure Audit Report
24 re: PO-16 - Timely Release Notifications. Exhibit 1709
25 is AT&T's Comments on the ROC OSS Final Report, filed

7869

1 6/4/02.

2

3 (The following exhibits were identified in
4 conjunction with OLIVER (WorldCom).)

5 Exhibit 1715 is Joint CLEC Comments on OSS
6 Report, filed 6/4/02. Exhibit 1716 is Exhibit A, ROC
7 OSS Test Final Report Issues. Exhibit 1717 is Exhibit
8 B, KPMG Report on test sections re: data from Eschelon,
9 McLeod and Covad, with chart. Exhibit 1718 is Exhibit
10 C, KPMG responses to WorldCom questions.

11

12 (The following exhibits were identified in
13 conjunction with JUDITH M. SCHULTZ, LYNN NOTARIANNI, AND
14 CHRISTOPHER J. VIVEROS (QWEST).)

15 Exhibit 1721 is Verified Comments Regarding
16 the ROC Final OSS Test Report (Exhibit JMS-T1, LMN-T2
17 and CJV-T1). Exhibit 1722 is Qwest Wholesale Change
18 Management Process Document (CMP Redesign
19 Framework)(Exhibit JMS-2). Exhibit 1723 is Ranking of
20 ATT Priority List Items Identified as 1's - 05-22-02
21 (Exhibit JMS-3). Exhibit 1724 is Ranking of ATT
22 Priority List Items Identified as 0's - 05-22-02
23 (Exhibit JMS-4). Exhibit 1725 is CMP Process
24 Improvements Matrix, 5-29-02 (Exhibit JMS-5). Exhibit
25 1726 is ROC T1764 EXP3094 KPMG 2nd Disposition

7870

1 Report 05 21 02.doc (Exhibit JMS-6). Exhibit 1727 is
2 ROC T1764 EXP3094 Qwest Response to KPMG 4th Supp
3 Rec 05 03 02.doc (Exhibit JMS-7). Exhibit 1728 is
4 ROC T1828 EXP3111 KPMG Disposition Report 04 04 02.doc
5 (Exhibit JMS-8). Exhibit 1729 is
6 ROC T1828 EXP3111 Qwest Supp Response 04 03 02.doc
7 (Exhibit JMS-9). Exhibit 1730 is ROC T1825 EXP3110 KPMG
8 2nd Disposition Report 05 21 02.doc (Exhibit JMS-10).
9 Exhibit 1731 is ROC T1825 EXP3110 Qwest Response to KPMG
10 3rd Supp Rec 05 10 02.doc (Exhibit JMS-11). Exhibit
11 1732 is Test Requirements Document (Exhibit LMN-3).
12 Exhibit 1733 is Master Test Plan (Exhibit LMN-4).
13 Exhibit 1734 is Regional Differences Assessment (Exhibit
14 LMN-5). Exhibit 1735 is PO-16 Michael Williams Email
15 5/20/02 (Exhibit LMN-6). Exhibit 1736 is PO-16 - Timely
16 Release Notifications - 20 May 02 Draft Revised Proposal
17 (redlined) (Exhibit LMN-7). Exhibit 1737 is PO-16 -
18 Timely Release Notifications - 20 May 02 Draft Revised
19 Proposal (non-redlined) (Exhibit LMN-8). Exhibit 1738
20 is Overview of Interface Testing (Exhibit LMN-9).
21 Exhibit 1739 is EDI Implementation Guidelines for IMA
22 05/03/02 (Exhibit LMN-10). Exhibit 1740 is SATE Users'
23 Group Meeting Minutes, November 13, 2001 (Exhibit
24 LMN-11). Exhibit 1741 is White Paper on SATE VICKI
25 (Dec. 7, 2001, Version 1.00) (Exhibit LMN-12). Exhibit

7871

1 1742 is White Paper on Flow through in SATE (Jan. 3,
2 2002, Version 1.00) (Exhibit LMN-13). Exhibit 1743 is
3 SATE Data Document (version 9.11) (Exhibit LMN-14).
4 Exhibit 1744 is Hewlett-Packard Company's SATE Summary
5 Evaluation Report for Qwest IMA-EDI SATE, Final Release
6 Version 2.0, December 21, 2001 (Exhibit LMN-15).
7 Exhibit 1745 is Qwest's Response to HP's SATE
8 Recommendations, ACC Docket No. T-00000A-97-0238,
9 December 22, 2001 (Exhibit LMN-16). Exhibit 1746 is HP
10 Comments on Qwest Response to Recommendations, February
11 14, 2002 (Exhibit LMN-17). Exhibit 1747 is
12 Hewlett-Packard Company's SATE New Release Test Summary
13 Report - 9.0 Transaction Test for Qwest IMA EDI SATE,
14 Version 2.0, March 29, 2002 ("HP SATE New Release Test
15 Summary Report") (Exhibit LMN-18). Exhibit 1748 is
16 IMA-EDI SATE VICKI Paths for the SATE, version 10.01,
17 May 17, 2002 (Exhibit LMN-19). Exhibit 1749 is
18 ROC T1908 OBS3108 KPMG Recommending Closure 05 22 02.doc
19 (Exhibit LMN-20). Exhibit 1750 is
20 ROC T1616 EXP3061 KPMG Disposition Report 03 14 02.doc
21 (Exhibit LMN-21). Exhibit 1751 is
22 ROC T1616 EXP3061 Qwest Response to KPMG 2nd Supp
23 Rec 03 05 02.doc (Exhibit LMN-22). Exhibit 1752 is
24 ROC-T1423 EXP3010 KPMG Disposition Report 02 20 02.doc
25 (Exhibit LMN-23). Exhibit 1753 is

7872

1 ROC T1423 EXP3010 KPMG 2nd Supp Rec RETEST 12 06 01.doc
2 (Exhibit LMN-24). Exhibit 1754 is
3 ROC T1789 EXP3104 KPMG Disposition Report 02 26 02.doc
4 (Exhibit LMN-25). Exhibit 1755 is
5 ROC T1789 EXP3104 Qwest Supp Response 02 19 02.doc
6 (Exhibit LMN-26). Exhibit 1756 is
7 ROC T1739 EXP3086 KPMG 2nd Disposition
8 Report 04 22 02.doc (Exhibit LMN-27). Exhibit 1757 is
9 ROC T1739 EXP3086 Qwest Response to KPMG 3rd Supp
10 Rec 04 19 02.doc (Exhibit LMN-28). Exhibit 1758 is
11 e3120disposition report.pdf (Exhibit LMN-29). Exhibit
12 1759 is ROC T1906 EXP3120 Qwest Response to KPMG
13 Comments 04 11 02.doc (Exhibit LMN-30). Exhibit 1760 is
14 ROC T1813 EXP3107 KPMG Disposition Report 02 26 02.doc
15 (Exhibit LMN-31). Exhibit 1761 is ROC
16 T1813 EXP3107 Qwest Response to KPMG Supp
17 Rec 02 21 02.doc (Exhibit LMN-32). Exhibit 1762 is
18 ROC T1588 EXP3055 KPMG Disposition Report 02 07 02.doc
19 (Exhibit LMN-33). Exhibit 1763 is
20 ROC T1588 EXP3055 Qwest Supp Response 02 01 02.doc
21 (Exhibit LMN-34). Exhibit 1764 is
22 ROC T1605 EXP3058 KPMG Disposition Report 01 03 02.doc
23 (Exhibit LMN-35). Exhibit 1765 is
24 ROC T1605 EXP 3058 Qwest Response to KPMG
25 Comments 10 25 01.doc (Exhibit LMN-36). Exhibit 1766 is

7873

1 ROC T1586 EXP3053 KPMG Disposition Report 01 03 01.doc
2 (Exhibit LMN-37). Exhibit 1767 is
3 ROC T1586 EXP3053 KPMG Supp Rec Retest 11 16 01.doc
4 (Exhibit LMN-38). Exhibit 1668 is
5 ROC T1818 EXP3109 KPMG Disposition Report 03 19 02.doc
6 (Exhibit LMN-39). Exhibit 1769 is
7 ROC T1818 EXP3109 Qwest Response to KPMG
8 Comments 03 13 02.doc (Exhibit LMN-40). Exhibit 1770 is
9 ROC T1678 EXP3077 KPMG Disposition Report 04 15 02.doc
10 (Exhibit LMN-41). Exhibit 1771 is
11 ROC T1678 EXP3077 Qwest Response to KPMG 2nd Supp
12 Rec 04 08 02.doc (Exhibit LMN-42). Exhibit 1772 is
13 ROC T1765 EXP3095 KPMG Disposition Report 04 11 02.doc
14 (Exhibit LMN-43). Exhibit 1773 is
15 ROC T1765 EXP3095 Qwest Response to KPMG 2nd Supp
16 Rec 04 05 02.doc (Exhibit LMN-44). Exhibit 1774 is
17 ROC T1499 EXP3029 KPMG Disposition Report 03 14 02.doc
18 (Exhibit LMN-45). Exhibit 1775 is
19 ROC T1499 EXP3029 Qwest Supp Response 02 25 02.doc
20 (Exhibit LMN-46). Exhibit 1776 is Qwest CEMR Log
21 Co-Provider Actual Activity (Exhibit LMN-47). Exhibit
22 1777-C is CEMR Performance Test Results: Qwest Detailed
23 Test Transaction Report Non-Design Services - Edit
24 Transactions 1/18/02 Part A (Exhibit LMN-C48A)
25 (CONFIDENTIAL). Exhibit 1778-C is CEMR Performance Test

7874

1 Results: Qwest Detailed Test Transaction Report
2 Non-Design Services - Edit Transactions 1/18/02 Part B
3 (Exhibit LMN-C48B) (CONFIDENTIAL). Exhibit 1779-C is
4 CEMR Performance Test Results: Qwest Detailed Test
5 Transaction Report Non-Design Services - Edit
6 Transactions 1/18/02 Part C (Exhibit LMN-C48C)
7 (CONFIDENTIAL). Exhibit 1780-C is CEMR Performance Test
8 Results: CONCURRENT TRANSACTION LOADS (Exhibit LMN-C48D)
9 (CONFIDENTIAL). Exhibit 1781 is CLEC Order volumes
10 (05/01/01 - 04/30/02) (Exhibit LMN-49). Exhibit 1782 is
11 CLEC Pre-Order Volumes (05/01/01 - 04/30/02) (Exhibit
12 LMN-50). Exhibit 1783-C is Number of CLECs
13 Certification Testing (Interoperability vs. SATE)
14 (Exhibit LMN-C51) (CONFIDENTIAL). Exhibit 1784 is
15 ROC T1827 OBS3086 KPMG Recommending Closure 04 12 02.doc
16 (Exhibit LMN-52). Exhibit 1785 is Qwest State Audit
17 Summary Disposition Codes - Minnesota Qwest State Audit
18 Summary Disposition Codes - Washington (Exhibit LMN-53).
19 Exhibit 1786 is Qwest's Responses to Commission
20 Questions on OSS Parity as posed in the Supplemental
21 Interpretive and Policy Statement in Docket No.
22 UT-970300 (dated March 15, 2002), June 3, 2002. Exhibit
23 1787 is Qwest's Summary of Closed/Unresolved
24 Observations and Exceptions in the ROC OSS Test, April
25 30, 2002. Exhibit 1788 is Qwest's Reply to AT&T's

7875

1 Response to Qwest's Summary of Closed/Unresolved
2 Observations and Exceptions in the ROC OSS Test, May 28,
3 2002. Exhibit 1789 is KPMG Consulting, Qwest's OSS
4 Evaluation, Observation and Exception Processes, Version
5 3.0, July 5, 2001. Exhibit 1790 is Nebraska Public
6 Service Commission Docket No. C-1830, In the Matter of
7 Qwest Corporation Filing Its Notice of Intention to File
8 Section 271(c) Application with the FCC and Request for
9 Commission to Verify Qwest Corporation's Compliance with
10 Section 271(c), Transcript of Proceedings, May 29, 2002.
11 Exhibit 1791 is Nebraska Public Service Commission
12 Docket No. C-1830, In the Matter of Qwest Corporation
13 Filing Its Notice of Intention to File Section 271(c)
14 Application with the FCC and Request for Commission to
15 Verify Qwest Corporation's Compliance with Section
16 271(c), Transcript of Proceedings, May 6, 2002. Exhibit
17 1792 is In the Matter of: The Application of US WEST
18 Communications, Inc. for Approval of Compliance with 47
19 U.S.C. 271(D)(2)(B), Docket No. 00-049-08 and 00-049-68
20 (Utah), Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings, Technical
21 Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, May 1, 2002. Exhibit
22 1793 is Transcripts of Vendor Technical Conferences held
23 on 3/4-5/02, 4/16/02, and 5/14-16/02, filed 5/28/02.
24 Exhibit 1794 is Qwest's Response to KPMG's Manual Order
25 Entry PID Adequacy Study of April 30, 2002, dated

7876

1 5/24/02.

2

3 (Hearing adjourned at 10:50 a.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25