Oversight Review Committee Meeting
April 13, 2006


In attendance:
Becky Quintana – Colorado PUC
Lynn Hankins – Covad
Loretta Huff – Qwest
Bonnie Johnson – Eschelon
Amanda Silva – VCI
Jill Martain – Qwest
Cindy Harlan – Qwest
Susan Lorence – Qwest
Kim Isaacs – Eschelon


Loretta Huff – Qwest reviewed the names of the attendees and determined that there was
a majority of the Oversight Committee present, which allowed the meeting to proceed.
Loretta explained that VCI submitted two change requests that were denied, which Qwest
would like to review.  The goal of this meeting is to obtain the recommendation and
direction of the Oversight Committee.

Loretta asked if everyone had a copy of or was familiar with SCR061405-01DS and
SCR061405-03DS.  These change requests look for two reports for Qwest to create.  The
first one is requesting the quantity of LSRs by user name, and the second one is
requesting a daily jeopardy / reject quantity by user name.  Bonnie Johnson – Eschelon
asked what was the denial reason for these CRs?  Loretta said the denial reason was "no
demonstrable business benefit" and that in looking at them further we also believe they
are outside the scope of CMP.  Bonnie asked was the reason "outside the scope of CMP"
an after thought?  Loretta stated yes.

Lynn Hankins – Covad asked where are the original CRs on the Qwest website.   Cindy
Harlan – Qwest directed Lynn to the CMP web page, under CRs, and then to the Archive
Interactive Report.

Loretta explained why these reports are outside the scope of CMP.  Loretta stated that we
looked at the CMP document and whether or not these CRs provide an effective interface
for provisioning service to the CLECS.  The CMP document includes pre-ordering,
ordering/provisioning, maintenance/repair and billing.  CMP allows the CLECs to have
an avenue to provide service and have their service work.  These CRs ask for a record of
CLEC staff production.  This goes beyond the scope of the CMP document

Amanda Silva – VCI stated that rejects and provisioning do fall within CMP.  We are
trying to send clean orders, and this data is needed for us to send clean LSRs.  It would
help both Qwest and VCI as it would reduce the number of errors.  Amanda stated VCI

does understand that they are responsible for user detail.  Other ILECs provide this type of data.  This would be an improvement to the system.  Qwest missed the reason for this request.  PID data doesn't allow VCI to offer training at the time it is needed, as PID data is only available 45 days out.  Amanda stated that she feels this request is within the scope as it does affect provisioning.

Loretta stated that a reject notice is sent right away when the LSR is submitted.  Rejects, completions and jeopardy notices are sent right away.  Qwest does provide information that tells you whether the order is accepted or rejected.  For Qwest to provide this by user id does go beyond the scope of CMP.  From a management and coaching perspective CLECs can go to IMA and pull summarized data for individual users.   Amanda stated that this is difficult as it is not downloadable.

Bonnie stated that she believes both Qwest and VCI are right.  Bonnie advised that she agrees with VCI that ordering and provisioning is part of CMP.  The crux of the problem is that Qwest is the only ILEC that does not provide this information in a GUI or having the data all in one place in a downloadable format.  The alternate solution that was previously provided was appreciated but not workable as it is not real time.  Bonnie stated that she is a little confused, as the request is related to ordering, where else would the CLECs go to get this from Qwest?  Maybe this should have been a process request.  Maybe there are other alternatives.  Bonnie stated that she has been told by CMP before that Qwest is not providing data that CLECs already have, but Qwest asks the CLEC for data examples all of the time.

Bonnie stated there is a benefit to Qwest to reduce rejects.  Working together is better for the business.  Maybe the denial reason got us off course.  Bonnie stated that she has expressed concern over the no demonstrable business benefit denial reason before.  Bonnie also said that Qwest has worked with her on her concerns.  CLECs believe rejects are as important to Qwest as they are to the CLECs.  Bonnie said we are not talking about the up front edits.  We are talking about rejects that a person handles.  Maybe we can work together with Qwest to somehow improve the reject situation.  Bonnie stated that she understands that Qwest sends the CLEC the reject and that Qwest does not want to compile the data by user.  Can we approach this another way?  Looking at the PID data is difficult.  Is there a way to handle and reduce rejects?

Lynn Hankins – Covad asked if Qwest has determined the level of effort to implement these changes.  Loretta stated that Qwest has at a high level.  Loretta stated that the majority of rejects occur at the BPL level.  These rejects come back instantaneously to the users.  Bonnie stated that she did not think we are talking about the BPL level.  Amanda – VCI stated that is correct.  We have many that come in after the BPL.  Jill Martain – Qwest stated that all rejects were asked for, even the BPL rejects.  Cindy Harlan – Qwest stated that is correct.  Amanda – VCI stated that is correct, we did ask for BPL rejects also.  Bonnie asked if this makes a difference.  Loretta stated that it does make a difference.  The amount of data is different and the manner in which we would obtain the data is different.  Bonnie stated that she didn't think BPL edits were included.

Jill Martain – Qwest stated that maybe we can take a look at making the data available, excluding BPL level data, in a downloadable format. Jill asked what about issuing a new change request and asking for existing reports in a downloadable format. We need to review the reports so we are on the same page. Bonnie stated that there is an existing CR that is a similar request. SCR032202-1 Post Order Status updates to GUI. Bonnie asked would it be possible to get this as part of 20.0. Jill asked what the prioritization number was for 20.0. Bonnie advised this CR was ranked as number five. Jill advised she doesn't know what opportunities are available to rank but maybe we could look at packaging options. Bonnie stated that maybe after the level of efforts are looked at in more detail number five could be included on the list. Jill stated that the originator may have to revise the CR.

Loretta asked if this satisfies the need. Amanda – VCI stated that yes it does, very much. Bonnie stated that this doesn't get to the BPL layer, but the others are the most painful. Loretta agreed. Bonnie stated that she now understands the confusion with the CR.

Loretta summarized the discussion as 1) instead of creating new reports we will look at the CR for downloadable IMA data and ensure items such as rejects and jeopardy information are included, 2) SCR032202-01 would be updated if needed, and 3) the disputes for the new report CRs (SCR061405-01DS and SCR061405-03DS) would be withdrawn. Loretta took a poll from each member to confirm agreement. Each oversight committee member on the call agreed with the summary. (Amanda Silva – VCI, Bonnie Johnson – Eschelon, Lynn Hankins – Covad, Loretta Huff – Qwest, Becky Quintana – CO PUC.) Becky Quintana – Colorado PUC also stated that it seems that this could have been handled outside of an Oversight Meeting but it is good that the issue was worked out. Loretta agreed that she was glad that the group worked it out.