



July 15, 2009

Product/Process CMP Team Meeting

Distribution Package

Product & Process / Systems Change Management Process (CMP) Monthly Meeting

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. (MT)

Wednesday, July 15, 2009

July Meeting will be held via conference call

Conference Bridge – 1-866-789-8819, Passcode *6273158*

Facilitator

Mark Coyne – Manager, Change Management

Agenda

All agenda times are approximate. The Systems portion of the meeting will start immediately following the Product/Process meeting.

<i>Time</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Presenter/Facilitator</i>
9:00 – 9:05	Introductions / Roll Call	Mark Coyne
9:05 – 9:10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Product Process Attachments: ❖ Announcements & Previous Meeting Minutes ❖ See Attachment A – Previous Meeting Minutes 	Mark Coyne
9:10 – 9:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Review Global Action Items ❖ See Attachment B – Global Action Items 	AI Owners / SMEs
9:15 – 9:20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Review “Active” CLEC Originated Change Requests ❖ See Attachment C – CLEC CRs 	CR Owners / SMEs
9:20– 9:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Review “Active” Qwest Originated Change Requests ❖ See Attachment D – Qwest CRs 	CR Owners / SMEs
9:30 – 9:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Discussion of CMP Operations and Proposed Modifications to CMP Framework ❖ See Attachment E 	Mark Coyne

Product & Process / Systems Change Management Process

9:45 – 10:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Walk On Items ❖ See Attachment F 	Requestor
<p>Agenda – Continued</p> <p>All agenda times are approximate. The Systems portion of the meeting will start immediately following the Product/Process meeting.</p>		
<i>Time</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Presenter/Facilitator</i>
10:00 – 10:05	<p>SYSTEMS ATTACHMENTS</p> <p>Prior Monthly Meeting Minutes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ See Attachment A 	Mark Coyne
10:05– 10:15	<p>Review New Change Requests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ See Attachment B – New CRs Initiated by CLECs ❖ See Attachment C – New CRs Initiated by Qwest ❖ See Attachment D – Regulatory & Industry Guideline CRs ❖ See Attachment E – Cross Over CRs ❖ See Attachment F – New “Walk On” CRs 	CR Originator
10:15– 10:25	<p>Review Change Requests for Closure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ See Attachment G – CRs to Consider for Closure 	Mark Coyne
10:25– 10:30	<p>Review Action Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ See Attachment H – Global Action Items ❖ See Attachment I – Action Items and Associated CRs 	Mark Coyne
10:30 – 10:35	<p>Outstanding Systems CMP Change Requests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ See Attachment J - Outstanding Systems CMP Change Requests 	Mark Coyne
10:35 – 10:40	<p>Deploying Change Requests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ See Attachment K – Deploying Change Requests 	Mark Coyne
10:40 – 10:45	<p>Production Support Tickets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ See Attachment L 	Mark Coyne
10:50– 11:00	<p>Walk On Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ See Attachment M 	Mark Coyne

Announcements

- August CMP Meeting – August 19, 2009 Time: 9:00 a.m. MT.
- CR Submission Deadline: August 5, 2009
 - During the CMP meeting, please follow these conference call guidelines:
 - All attendees, whether in person or by phone, must identify themselves and the company they represent.
 - The facilitator will mute all lines on the conference bridge once the call begins.
 - Push *6 to go on and off mute
 - If you are not speaking, please push *6 on your phone.
 - Please do not put your phone on hold if you have music hold.
 - Check the positioning of your mouthpiece if you are using a headset.
 - Don't say or do things you don't want others to hear during the call.
 - If you're speaking with others in your office, mute your phone by pushing *6.
 - If you are unable to hear the conversation in the room, please interrupt to let the facilitator know.
 - For those in the room:
 - Please hold side conversations outside the conference room.
 - Position the microphone in front of you when speaking.
- The Qwest OSS Interface Release Calendar can be found at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/teammeetings.html>
- Interactive Reports for all CMP Change Requests can be found at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/changerequest.html>
- The Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process Document can be found at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/index.html>
- The CMP Points of Contact: Lists, to update or add can be found at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/index.html>

Attachment A - Prior Meeting Minutes

**Change Management Process (CMP) Monthly Meeting
Product - Process
Wednesday, June 17, 2009**

Introductions and Announcements

Mark Coyne-Qwest began the meeting with introductions.

Prior Monthly Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)

Mark Coyne-Qwest asked if there were any additional questions or comments on the Prior Monthly Meeting Minutes.

Review Global Action Items (Attachment B)

There were no Global Action Items for the June Product/Process Meeting.

Review Active CLEC Originated Change Requests (Attachment C)

There were no new CLEC CRs for the June Product/Process Meeting.

Review Active Qwest Initiated Change Requests (Attachment D)

PC021109-1 End the Qwest Specialized Customer Premise Equipment Program

Mark Coyne-Qwest said this became effective 5/18/09 and asked if there was any objection to closure. There was no objection.

PC031408-01 Digital Certificate Cleanup

Mark Coyne-Qwest said this is the Digital Certificate cleanup where we have worked with each company and we are ready to close this project as it is completed. Mark said that we looked at over 8500 certificates.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that she wanted to check with Joyce Bilow (PAETEC) to see if their effort was done.

Mark Coyne-Qwest asked if they had changes to submit.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that she wanted to verify before closing this CR.

PC121208-01 Eliminate the establishment of Remote Access Forwarding and Scheduled Forwarding on Custom Ringing Numbers

Mark Coyne-Qwest said this became effective on 5/15/09 and asked if there was any objection to closure. There was no objection.

PC121608-01 Improvements to CNLA and Mailout Sub categories

Mark Coyne-Qwest said this was effective 5/29/09 and there was still cleanup going on. We will leave open for 1 more month.

PC032409-1 Expedites and Escalation – Change to remove UDF Product

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that the level 4 announced on 6/8/09 and will become effective on 7/23/09.

PC052609-1 Grandfather Radio Carrier Listings

Cindy Schwartze-Qwest said that Qwest will be grandfathering the Mobile Radio Service Listing (USOC – L96) and the Mobile Unit Number Listing (USOC – LMS) in Arizona, Montana and New Mexico. Cindy said that there are 43 wholesale

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

customers with the L96 USOC and no customers with LMS. She said that the implementation is scheduled for September 1, 2009 and no sunset date has been determined.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if any CLECs had this product.

Cindy Schwartze-Qwest said there are no Wholesale customers. There are 43 Wholesale accounts with a handful of wireless customers.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if Qwest contacts them separately.

Cindy Schwartze-Qwest said that the notification will go out but we won't be contacting them because we are just grandfathering. She said that we won't be moving the customers off because there is no sunset date.

PC060509-1 LIS PCAT Changes

Sandy Stulen-Qwest said that Qwest is submitting Level 4 LIS PCAT changes as a result of changes that were originally submitted as a Level 2. She said that we may be adding additional items in the process of reviewing the changes. She said that the original Level 2 changes that will now be a Level 4 are:

LIS Mid Span Meet POI Subsection, Trunking Subsection, process relating to the (LERG) and the LIS to AT Switch Subsection, (SPOP).

Sandy said that will be looking at some other changes to determine if they should be a level 3 or 4.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if Qwest was planning to let the level 2s expire before Qwest submits the Level 4 changes so there won't be overlapping notices.

Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we want to close out the level 2's that we received approval to move forward on from the March meeting. Susan said that we will get those submitted and implemented. Susan said that a final notice will go out to communicate what is and isn't going forward and then we will start addressing the level 4s.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that would be great to let the level 2's work their course and then submit the level 4's.

Discussion of CMP Operations and Proposed Modifications to CMP Framework

Status of Request for CMP Oversight Review regarding Section 2.6 of the CMP Document

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that the Oversight Committee met on 6/3/09 and the minutes can be found on the Qwest Wholesale website. Mark said that as a result of that meeting it was agreed that a notice referencing Integra's PID request would be sent out and that Qwest would issue a CR to update the language in section 2.6 and that further discussion would take place on the language. Mark said that the notification went out yesterday and the CR was submitted by Qwest to address the language in Section 2.6.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she wanted to say that meeting minutes from that call and her comments support (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) THAT QWEST IS FREE TO SUBMIT ANY CR QWEST WISHES TO SUBMIT and that there was concurrence with that BUT NOT A RECOMMENDATION TO DO THAT. THE MEETING MINUTES IMPLIED THAT THE CLEC AGREED WITH QWEST'S POSITION THAT 2.6 NEED TO BE UPDATED, WHICH WAS NOT THE CASE. However, Bonnie said that Integra's position is that they feel no change was needed to the document.

Mike Williams-Qwest said that Qwest's position is that the PID Administration Group does not exist and has not existed for years. He said Qwest has no obligation left under Section 2.6 because there is no PID Administration Group. Mike said the Qwest CR simply removes the PID Administration Group language and replaces it with generic language. (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) MIKE SAID HE UNDERSTANDS INTEGRA DISAGREES WITH QWEST'S INTERPRETATION. He said it represents the intent of parties, in considering Section 2.6, to facilitate communication if a PID question arises. He said the CMP process was not designed to handle PID issues but Qwest recognizes there may be items that spill back and forth to and from CMP. When that happens, notification will get distributed. No matter what you call it, the parties in CMP have access to communication. Making this change allows us agree to disagree on why we're

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

revising the language or on what happens in any given interaction while still facilitating the distribution of PID-related notices and communications as intended, overall, by Section 2.6.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said they (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) ARE NOT REFUSING TO REVIEW THE CHANGES AND will look at the change and consider the change. She said they believe the CMP document anticipated a successor and Integra doesn't believe the PID Administration Group is a defined group. She said that it could be any group of people REVIEWING A PID not A that particular group. She SAID WHILE A PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE NO LONGER EXIST SHE disagrees that the PID group is no longer operating. Bonnie asked if they should send comments back to CMP or Mark.

Susan Lorence-Qwest said that with a CR there is an option for a call. We could schedule an ad hoc call to review the language (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) IF THE GROUP FELT THERE WAS A NEED FOR THE AD HOC CALL. BUT IF ANYONE HAS COMMENTS OR any proposed changes TO THEIR REDLINE IT should be sent to Qwest.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said they would like an ad hoc call because there are fundamental issues (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) UNDERLYING THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE CHANGES that they need clarified before they can comment on the redline.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we will schedule an ad hoc meeting prior to any changes to the redline being submitted.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said she needs to understand how the process works and what the PID group looks like etc. to determine if she would agree to the language Qwest is proposing and that we need an adhoc meeting before the redline.

Mark Coyne-Qwest asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that Qwest SAID IT merely lifted the PID Administration group language but there are other changes besides than just deleting that language.

Mike Williams-Qwest said it was to make it more readable and to make it fit with the remaining language. It was our sincere intent not to create anything new and to determine how section 2.6 could go forward.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC asked that the State Commissions be invited to the ad hoc meeting.

Liz Balvin-Covad said that she agreed with having an ad hoc meeting. Liz said they have a fundamental concern when someone is not proactively looking at the documentation and that the PID administration group no longer exists. She said she thought that Qwest undertook some time ago and was surprised this wasn't triggered at that time.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that with the infrequency of using this section for changing PID etc and it hasn't been looked. We knew it would be difficult to change that language and it hasn't occurred until now.

PC050409-1CM Increased clarity in Qwest –initiated proposed documentation changes, including avoiding overlapping notices and modifying notices if an overlapping change is unavoidable.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that in the May meeting we had a discussion regarding Integra's changes to Section 2.5. Mark said that Integra presented their redline changes and Qwest also submitted its proposed changes to that language. Mark said that Integra has reviewed the change and has made additional changes. Mark said that we are in the process of reviewing and hope to bring this to a close in July.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that the document on the calendar is the redline that she and Julia used after Qwest redlined their changes. Bonnie said they accepted those changes and what you see is language that is currently not in the CMP document. She said that when we reach consensus there will be a lot more changes than this. She said it easier to accept changes rather than work from the original CMP document.

**Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes
PC060209-1CM Update Section 5.8 of the CMP Document to add a new CR status of “Crossover”**

Lynn Stecklein-Qwest said that during the operation of this CMP, there may be situations when systems CRs have requirements for product/process discussions or solutions, or when product/process CRs require System solutions. If a CR submitted to the product/process CMP is discovered to require a mechanized solution the following will occur: Qwest will open a new systems CR, on behalf of the original CR originator, with a reference to the product/process CR number. Qwest will close the product/process CR with a reference to the new systems CR number. If a CR submitted to the Systems CMP is discovered to require a manual solution the following will occur: Qwest will open a product/process CR, on behalf of the original CR originator, with a reference to the systems CR number. Qwest will close the systems CR with a reference to the new product/process CR number. In these scenarios, the CR being closed will be updated with the “crossover” status. Lynn said that Qwest will conduct the vote in the July meeting and will send out a vote notification.

General CMP Comments:

None.

Walk On Items

Provisioning and Installation V125

Kim Isaacs-Integra said that the Provisioning and Installation PCAT was updated to include instructions for Resale and QLSP orders only and that you need to include buried wire USOCs and if Qwest is doing the trenching the USOCs need to be included 6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) ON THE LSR. KIM ASKED FOR QWEST TO CONFIRM THAT THE PROCESS DOES NOT INCLUDE UBL. Kim said that for UBL there are a number of choices for the type of cable and what type, lengths of cable and when it’s appropriate to use over protective cable and how we communicate that WHICH TYPE AND LENGTHS OF CABLE SHOULD BE USED ON OUR LSRS.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that they were concerned that in dealing with the customer they won’t be able to answer those questions and the Qwest engineering that drive those decisions. She asked if they would 1st confer with Qwest engineering because the customer won’t know lengths required etc.

Nora Torres-Time Warner asked what instruction does Qwest use for internal reps to ensure they are providing correct information in the retail environment with the wiring process. Nora said that if Qwest is doing this today they could just utilize.

Bob Mohr-Qwest said that the intent of the change was for products today where we have the capability of submitting USOCs with the LSR (resale, QLSP and retail POTS). Bob said it was never intended to modify the current process for UBL requests.

Kim Isaacs-Integra asked for clarification when they request buried service wire on UBL loop, Qwest will make the decision on cable type and length.

Bob Mohr-Qwest said that we would not expect to see those USOCs in the remarks.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if Qwest requires retail customer to make those decisions.

Bob Mohr-Qwest said that on the retail side we are asking for these specific USOCs for the type of cable requested to be buried.

Jamal Boudhaouia-Qwest said that BSW should be sized based on the service need with any request above and beyond standard sizing considering special construction. He said that for residential customers, 3 pair BSW is typical since we

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

currently size at 2 pair per deeded unit. For commercial properties, we typically place OSP cable; however, if the line requirement is 12 pairs or less, the engineer may opt to placing (2) 6-pair BSWs and not place OSP cable. Jamal said that protection/sheath type typically falls under engineering judgment, based on the area conditions. Although the sheath is reinforced for protection against rodents/gophers, gopher protect BSW may also be common in rocky areas to protect from (possible) rocks being placed back in the open trench during back-fill (excessive rocks should be removed/dispose and replaced with select back-fill; however, if the builder/customer is providing the trench and backfill, we don't have control over this).

Kim Isaacs-Integra asked how the CLEC contacts the engineer to determine which USOCs they need for the LSR.

Jamal Boudhaouia-Qwest said that we need to research the process and get answers.

Kim Isaacs-Integra said that there question was who decided which cable to use for the CLEC, Qwest or the end user.

Jamal Boudhaouia-Qwest said that the engineer would let the end user know which cable should be placed.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if the document could be revised to provide additional detail and instructions on what they should do.

Qwest agreed that the document could be revised.

Jamal Boudhaouia-Qwest said that the length the service wire should not exceed 300 feet.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC asked what happens if they don't have the USOCs or information on the LSR (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) WHEN IT IS SUBMITTED.

Bob Mohr-Qwest said he believed that with the enhancement of adding the USOCs is the way you request buried service wire going forward. He said we need to research how the CLEC would know before submitting the LSR and what would happen if they are not there.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said if they aren't making that determination and the Qwest engineer is going to make it anyway, why they have to ask. Bonnie said that it seems like an extra step, they will have to contact before hand on the UBL. She said she didn't understand if the CLEC don't make the determination (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) HOW THIS IS and identified as an enhancement to a product.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that she agreed (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) AGREED WITH INTEGRA and SHE can see how this helps Qwest TO PUT them in a BETTER position to charge MORE for those services. Julia said HER CONCERN IS IT SEE THAT this ADDED STEP will forestall the ORDERING process and wanted to know if there is another place they can put this INFORMATION in the process SUCH AS feedback loop IN THE PROCESS or feedback from Qwest TECH to keep things moving ON THE FRONT END. She said that MANY OF there customers EITHER won't have THIS information OR IT WILL BE WRONG INFORMATION. AND we will miss dates, get charged INCORRECTLY and it doesn't seem like THIS PROCESS will work for them or their customers. She wants to figure out if there is an ALTERNATIVE process that DELAY them from processing their orders SUCH AS with a follow up be easier to work with.

Bob Mohr-Qwest said that he understood their concerns and that the intent was to enhance the previous special construction process and Bart billing.

Laurie Fredrickson-Integra said that there are 2 different USOCs for trenching; 1 price for 300 ft and 1 price for 301 to 600 feet. She said if their customer estimates about 300 feet and it turns out to be 350 feet, those rates almost double. Laurie said that if they miscalculate the estimate that they give the end user it will double.

Bob Mohr-Qwest said that he was not familiar with the pricing but he believed that the pricing is the same as it is today for the special construction job and they are just splitting it out between the USOCs trying to automate.

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

Kim Isaacs-Integra said that the pricing may be the same and there was no pricing change but on the special construction process they were given a quote after submitting the order. Kim said they need a solid quote to give to the customer to make sure they want Qwest to do the trenching or not.

Bob Mohr-Qwest said that we need to go back to the process group to better understand how the CLEC would know this information upfront.

Kim Isaacs-Integra asked if there would be a delayed response if Qwest can't before the Qwest response is due.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we would do that.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC asked Qwest to find out (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) AND IDENTIFY what happens if the information from the customer is wrong, FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE cable length IS TOO SHORT OR LONG OR IF THE TRENCH THE CUSTOMER DIGS IS NOT RIGHT etc. what happens and how is that addressed.

Level 3 effective date changes

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that this was a follow up from a concern that Integra raised in the May CMP Meeting. The concern is when an effective date on a level 3 is revised. Mark said that due to the infrequency of this happening, we did some checking and found that in 2005 there were 11 occurrences and in the past 2 ½ years there was 1 occurrence. Mark said that the CMP document does allow Qwest to do this if there are no comments.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if there are no comments on the process change itself and if they were to request a date certain, would Qwest honor that. She said that if Qwest says no, Qwest is begging for comments (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) WHEN A CLEC MAY NOT HAVE COMMENTED.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that this happens in about 1 out of 1000 notices if not less. He said that we need to invoke this process; Qwest has the right to that.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC asked if they would have to send in a comment (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) ON ALL NOTICES to request that the date not be moved.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we are trying not to make extra work. Since it happens so infrequently, it may end up that way if the CLECs were to send in a comment on every level 3.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) FOR EXAMPLE, IF QWEST ISSUED a level 3 with 45 days TO IMPLEMENT and PAETEC HAD no comments, THEN QWEST SENT a notice THAT THE CHANGE WOULD BE IMPLEMENTED 15 days. She said that if CLEC there is no problem with the change itself, but the CLECs need the full 45 days TO IMPLEMENT, is that when CLEC would send a comment that they need the date to be longer.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we make the determination if we can stay with the 45 days or move it.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said they can submit a comment during the comment cycle deadline. There are other CMP processes to request an earlier implementation date. Bonnie said that she is hearing this happens on rare occasions but if the CLEC requests that the date not change and Qwest can't guarantee they will honor that, Integra will have to react accordingly.

Susan Lorence-Qwest said that one point to make is that this happens as a rare occurrence. If we have an effective that we need to adhere to, we send the notice based on the number of days that we have. We have to adhere to 15 days on the level 3 for comments. We are shortening the Qwest response period. The notice can't be shorter than the 31 days we have.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) said that BECAUSE IT IS A RARE OCCURRENCE; they don't want to comment on every level 3 TO STATE THAT THEY DON'T WANT QWEST TO move up the date. RATHER, SINCE WE DON'T HAVE AN ISSUE WITH THE CHANGE, WILL IT

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

SUFFICE TO SUBMIT THE COMMENT "WE NEED MORE TIME AND THE ORIGINAL IMPLEMENTATION TO BE MAINTAINED" WHEN WE RECEIVE THE SECOND NOTICE FROM QWEST THAT THE DATE IS BEING MOVED UP? DOES OUR COMMENT HAVE TO BE WITH THE FIRST NOTICE OR IS IT OKAY TO COMMENT ON THE UPDATED NOTICE IF WE DIDN'T COMMENT ON THE FIRST?

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we would never shorten the final notice period of 15 days.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she wanted to clarify that this isn't typical. If there are no comments is Qwest changing the date whether Qwest has a need or not.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that the condition is extremely rare. If we need to shorten the Qwest response by 3 or 7 days that is what we will do. Normally, if we need to shorten it you will see it on the initial notice. We know that ahead of time and you are all aware of what that looks like.

Power Monitoring Quotes

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said they have a situation where Qwest has changed an internal process and didn't go through the CMP process. Julia said it has had an adverse affect on them and was not sure how to approach the negative impact. (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) WITHIN THE CMP PROCESS SINCE THERE IS NOT A RECORD OF THE EXTERNAL PROCESS.

Mark Coyne-Qwest asked if an internal process changed an external process.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that 3 or 4 months ago they (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) CEASED getting quotes on collo for the POWER meter readings PAETEC BECAME AWARE OF THE "MISSING" QUOTES when they received their bill AND they noticed a huge increase WHICH IS THE BASIS OF A DISPUTE. IN THE PAST WE WOULD HAVE RECEIVED THE POWER METER QUOTES, AND INVESTIGATED THE BASIS FOR THOSE POWER METER CHANGES AND DONE SUPPLEMENTAL READINGS PRIOR TO ANY OF THE METER READING CHANGES ON THE BILL. However, Qwest decided not to provide quotes and didn't go through CMP PROCESS. Julia said that THOSE POWER METER READINGS WERE A RESULT OF THE MEASURED POWER AMMENDMENTS THAT PAETEC HAS IN ALL 14 STATES. UPON OUR INQUIRY TRIGGERED BY THE INCREASED BILL, Kathy Battles (Qwest) advised PAETEC THAT this process had been changed WITHOUT GOING THROUGH CMP. Julia said that she does not TAKE ALL OF THESE ISSUES through the dispute process IF WE CAN ADDRESS THEM HERE IN CMP.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that there is a team looking at the issue and that he didn't have a lot of details but we will get the information and provide a response.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC asked if an external process (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) IMPACTING CLECS is changed, is it Qwest's position to go through CMP.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that if an external process is changed, it goes through CMP and asked what the impact of the change is.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that the (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) QWEST'S process is to do POWERE READINGS AND SUBMIT QUOTES ON 2-3 states per month THUS GETTING THE REQUIRED 6-MONTH READING. I BELIEVE WE HAVE had no quotes for the last 3 months OR SO.

Susan Lorence-Qwest said been involved and the change should have come through CMP. We are working with the SMEs to determine if we can change the process back or improve the process and will send out a notice accordingly.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said they don't want to do a dispute (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) EXTRA ISSUES if THEY can be handled in CMP. She said they would also like a notice on the past quotes FOR THE STATES that were missed.

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that the goal is to ensure that until discussed (Minnesota power issue thing) the CLEC be engaged in process.

Susan Lorence-Qwest said yes we will reinstate the process or propose a change in CMP. She said that we will report a miss and schedule an adhoc meeting on what we are proposing. She said we are working with Product and Process SMEs and the service manager on the best approach.

6/22/09 Qwest Response: This is in response to the Power Monitoring quote issue that PAETEC brought up in the monthly CMP meeting on June 17. The current process to provide quotes is being re-instated. In the meantime, Qwest is continuing to meet internally to review the current Power Monitoring process and determine the best way to proceed in the long term. An ad hoc meeting in the near term will not be scheduled until a determination is made whether the process will be modified through CMP.

The June Product Process CMP Meeting was adjourned.

Maintain Meeting Details

Meeting Name:	JuneProdProcCMPMeeting	Type	Monthly PNP
Meeting Date	06/17/2009	Area	Wholesale ProdProc

Attendee	Company	Attendance Type
Allen, Doug	AT&T	On Phone
Balvin, Liz	Covad	On Phone
Boudhaouia, Jamal	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Chapman, Mindy	Neustar Inc	On Phone
Coyne, Mark	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
DeRosier, Judy	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Houston, Neil	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Isaacs, Kim	Integra	On Phone
Johnson, Bonnie	Integra	On Phone
Lorence, Susan	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Miles, Linda	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Mohr, Bob	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Nelson, Jamie	POPP Telecom	On Phone
Redman-Carter, Julia	McLeodUSA	On Phone
Roberson, Laurie	Integra	On Phone
Schwartz, Cindy	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Stecklein, Lynn	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Stewart, Karen	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Stulen, Sandy	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Tessema, Meteknesh	Accenture	On Phone
Thurnau, Wendy	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Torrez, Nora	Time Warner Telecom	On Phone
Weidenbach, Georganne	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Williams, Mike	Qwest Corporation	On Phone

Attachment B – Global Action Items

(There are no new Global Action Items for the July Product/Process CMP Meeting)

Attachment C – CLEC CRs

(There are no new CLEC CRs for the July Product/Process CMP Meeting)

Attachment D – Qwest CRs

**Summary Change Management Process - Product & Proces
Qwest Initiated CRs**

Report Line Number	CR #	Title	Company	Current Status	Owner	Director	CRPM
1	PC121608-01	Improvements to CNLA and Mailout Sub categories	Qwest Corporation	CLEC Test	Lorence, Susan		Stecklein, Lynn
2	PC032409-1	Expedites and Escalation - Change to remove UDF Product	Qwest Corporation	Development	Wells, Joan		Stecklein, Lynn
3	PC052609-1	Grandfather Radio Carrier Listings	Qwest Corporation	Presented	Schwartz, Cindy		Stecklein, Lynn
4	PC060509-1	LIS PCAT Changes	Qwest Corporation	Presented	Stulen, Sandy		Stecklein, Lynn

Open Product/Process Qwest CRs - Detail

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC121608-01	Improvements to CNLA and Mailout Sub categories	05/29/2009 CLEC Test	Wholesale ProdProc		Impacts notifications related to all products and processes

**Director
Originator
Owner
CRPM**

Originating Company: Qwest Corporation

Description of Change

Qwest reviewed the CNLA history and proposed changes to the current categories/subcategories via Level 2 web notice : WEBS.12.24.08.F.05630.NoticeSubjectLine_CNLA. Qwest received a CLEC request to change the disposition of the notice to a Level 4 type change. Qwest conducted an ad hoc meeting on 12/15/08. See wholesale calendar for details <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/calendar/> There was agreement that Qwest would retract the Level 2 notice and issue the CR to work together on determining what sub categories need to exist. During the ad hoc meeting, a CLEC suggested that each participating CLEC may take a specific category to review and recommend appropriate sub categories/changes. More useable CNLA; improved ability to locate notices

Status History

Date	Action	Description
06/25/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the June ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
05/20/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the May ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
05/20/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to CLEC Test
05/15/2009	Communicator Issued	WEBS.05.15.09.F.06399.FNLCustNoticeLettrArchive
05/01/2009	Communicator Issued	WEBS.05.01.09.F.06335.CustNoticeLetterArchive
04/15/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the April CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
04/02/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Development
03/18/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the March CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
02/26/2009	Communicator Issued	CMPR.02.26.09.F.06105.CMP_AdHocMtg_CNLA
02/18/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the February Monthly CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
01/27/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
01/21/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the January Prod/Proc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
01/15/2009	General Meeting Held	ADHOC Meeting Held
12/16/2008	CR Submitted	CR submitted
12/16/2008	CR Acknowledged	CR acknowledged
12/15/2008	General Meeting Held	ADHOC Meeting Held
11/24/2008	Communicator Issued	WEBS.11.24.08.F.05630.NoticeSubjectLine_CNLA

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

6/17/09 ProductProcess CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said this was effective 5/29/09 and there was still cleanup going on. We will leave open for 1 more month. 5/20/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said that the level 2 notice was sent 5/1/09 to become effective 5/29/09. He reminded everyone the goal is to migrate all notices by 5/29/09 but due to the volume of notices we may go beyond that date. After that date, notices that have not been moved will be placed in the MISC category. 4/15/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said that there have been a number of adhoc meetings and that the matrix is being updated and will be sent out to the CLECs later this week for review. He said that we will be reviewing this internally and will send a notice possibly this week or early next week. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she wanted to talk about the 2 outstanding action items from the last call. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that for those who were not familiar with the questions, they are posted to the Wholesale Calendar, March 26th adhoc meeting. She said that the 2 issues were associated with how we were using the Contract category in CNLA. She said that the other issue was associated with the Regulatory category. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that they don't agree that template is a contract and should fall under Contract. She said that Qwest (4/24/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra) said they are going to keep it under Process and that as long as Qwest has a separate category

they would agree. She said that Qwest also said that they would be including a sub note for Template. She said that when Qwest made the 1st run of the Expedite PCAT and the Arizona order, they objected to Qwest making any other changes that were not related to the Regulatory order. Bonnie said they believe that any changes as a result of a Regulatory order should only be what is Regulatory in nature. She asked for an example of when you are going combining changes that are non-Regulatory with Regulatory changes as a result of an order. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that is the only example of that are with changes where clarifications were included. Susan said that we did get with our SMEs to separate those. Susan said that in every other instance we used the level 1 and level 3 change categories related to the Regulatory order under Product/Process. Susan said that the example of where they would be mixed would be for a CMP release notice with a system release where there may be something else incorporated in that release. She said that with the 22.1 point release, the LNP port requirements, that would have included Regulatory in the subject line because it was system notification update specific to that Regulatory order. Susan said that if there happened to be a Regulatory that could fit in an upcoming release, for example, the upcoming release in April, we could accommodate the current release date and add Regulatory requirements to meet that period of implementation. She said that was the example in the bottom as including Regulatory in the subject line that we wouldn't commit to putting it there because there all other things in that system release beside just Regulatory changes. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said they agree and does understand the system issue. She said if there are PCAT updates associated with the system work, those PCATs updates should be kept separate. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we could agree to that but that she did have a concern if there was an LSOG change and those updates are in the full blown LSOG release she would want to work with the documentation SMEs to see how difficult it would be to split those out. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that the releases are smaller than they used to be and asked if Qwest could check on that. She said they would consider making an exception for those if there isn't a tremendous amount of difficulty. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we agree if those Product/Process updates are distinct. Susan said that we hope to get the matrix out by the end of the week to give everyone a chance to see what has been agreed to and then get the notice out early next week. She said that there are some benefits to this application and format that we want to introduce. 3/18/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we had an adhoc meeting on 3/2/09 and the matrix is being updated with the changes. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that they would like to see the final matrix. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that she will be sending out the final view of the categories to all meeting participants. Brenda Bloemke-Comcast asked that another call be scheduled. Susan Lorence-Qwest asked if everyone was ok with issuing a Level 2 notice. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that would be fine if we have agreement on the final view. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that there should be no outstanding issues. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that they would like to look at it as a whole. 2/18/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we have had several adhoc meetings and another is scheduled on 2/19. Mark said that we will leave this CR open. 2/19/09 Adhoc Meeting Attendees: Bonnie Johnson-Integra, Kim Isaacs-Integra, Brenda Bloemke-Comcast, Kasha Fauscett-Comcast, Susan Lorence-Qwest, Carrie Bell-Qwest, Sandie Tekavec-Qwest, Lynn Stecklein-Qwest Susan Lorence-Qwest said that the agenda and a screen print Web example were posted to the Wholesale calendar. Susan said we would like to start by talking about the Web example. She said that the one concern was that you had to scroll page by page in the subcategory and that all the notices did not display on 1 page. She said another concern was that you couldn't search by the notice number or key word. Susan said that this new functionality should resolve these concerns. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that Qwest is very excited about this new functionality and knew that everyone was interested in not having to scroll thru page by page to find the notice that you were looking for. Carrie said that the example provided shows that you will have the capability to select a notice in a subcategory and see all the notices from that section on one page be able to scroll from top to bottom and see the notices in order by date. She said that you will have the opportunity to do a find within the page when you type in a word. Carrie said that this will be a handy feature and will be helpful when it comes to searching for notices. Carrie said that we have also added the search results with the total number of notices at the top of the page. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that currently that information is at the bottom of the page with the range and now you will have the capability to look at all of them. Susan said that it is really quick and smooth. Kim Isaacs-Integra said there is a search function at the top of the page and asked if you would you need to know the name of the category or subcategory. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that you would. She said that we wanted to make it clear so we don't have overlap among the categories and subcategory categories. Susan said that it defeats the purpose if you have to go thru multiple categories to look for a notice. Kim Isaacs-Integra asked if there would be an opportunity to get the full list by category. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that it currently works by category and subcategory connected. She said that the other option is to search by year and month and wondered if that might cover it. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that searching by year would be better than searching by the year and month. Carrie Bell-Qwest asked if they would have any idea of the subject they are looking for in this example. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that they would have a slight idea of the subject and time. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that we can check into that. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that she did like the new functionality. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that they really appreciate the change. She said that when you click on the link to get to the notices in CNLA it takes along time to load. She asked if this change will alleviate the time it takes to load CNLA. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that the databasef very large with many attachments. Carrie said that we are moving to a new platform and would hope to see some improvement. She said that we could not guarantee that it would, for example, go from 5 seconds to 1 second. She said that we are looking at ways to improve this tool within our budget and time limitations and if we find an opportunity we can look at that. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that it was not a request just a question. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that our major focus for this rework is to look at the categories and pair down some of the categories that will streamline the tool. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if the find function would only apply to what is on the page and not anything embedded in the announcement itself. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that was correct. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that it was similar to any search capability. Susan thanked Kim Isaacs (Integra) for her proposal on the categories. She said that Qwest proposed two CMP subcategory categories – CMP Process and Meetings and Integra suggested adding the categories of Escalation, Oversight, Voting and Prioritization. She said that the 4 letter abbreviation will change when they are sent thru mail outs and today they only have the category abbreviation. Susan said that going forward we will also be adding a subcategory in the notice number in addition to the date. Susan said the subcategory for Escalation would be ESCA and for Oversight it would be OVRS. Susan said that in the Escalation category there are no meeting notices and the Oversight category requests for membership, submitted issues and their outcome would be included. She said that the notices for an Oversight are e-mails. She said Integra's proposal is that that these subcategories would include Meeting notices and said that Qwest would like to keep those in the MEETS category vs. under the subcategory of Escalation or Oversight. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she understands that e-mails to the Oversight members are sent to coordinate a date and time for Oversight meetings and is not notice. She said that that the Oversight Committee members have not been updated and asked when that will be done. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that she has it on her calendar and will get it updated. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that in the Oversight section of the CMP document it states that anyone can attend these meetings. She said that we could talk about this at a later date but that she though notices should be sent for Oversight and Escalations. She said that she wants to get all information for Escalations and Oversight in one place and in the same category. She said that she received feedback from other CLECs and that they operate in the same mode. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that the Meeting category would have all adhoc meetings and if we determine that meetings should be in the Escalation and Oversight category, they would not be in both places. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that if it's not related to an Escalation or Oversight issue it would be in the meeting category. Susan Lorence-Integra said that we had an issue with the Voting and Prioritization category. She said that those are held at meetings and there will always be a notice. She said that the number of prioritization notices is low and that we would like to keep all adhoc meetings together with the exception of what we just talked about on Escalations and Oversight. She said that if you wanted to know about the most recent vote notice and you do a search it would take you to that vs. having a subset of Voting or Prioritization and trying to figure if it was associated with a CR, adhoc meeting, exception etc. She said that they are noticed on a meeting notice and would include vote disposition, late adder or any kind of vote and would be under Meeting vs. adding a subcategory. She said that we are trying to make sure they get to where they should be slotted and would like to make it as clean as possible. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said the last place she would look for Voting or Prioritization notices would be in Meetings and does not logically make sense to her. She said that the subcategory full name doesn't identify Votes or Prioritization. She said that Agenda, Announcements and Materials for the full name is broad and general. Susan Lorence-Qwest asked if it would help to add Vote to that because the vote always occurs in a meeting. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she would not look there but if the subcategory included the full name, it might work. Kim Isaacs-Integra said it would work if the subcategory included the full name and if there was some way to know that

Meets includes Voting and Prioritization. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we could include Meeting agenda, Announcements, Materials and Votes. Kim Isaacs-Integra asked where the full name would appear in the tool. Susan Lorence-Qwest asked Carrie if we could put the full name in the description at the top of the page. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that you would have already selected this information on the page you are looking at. She said that we can put it on the initial page when you select the subcategory Kim Isaacs-Integra said that it would work if it is in the pull down. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we could make the subcategory Meetings, Announcements, Material, Vote Disposition with the full subcategory name. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if there was a character limitation. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that she would have to check but said that the shorter it is would be better for the drop down box. Susan Lorence-Qwest suggested we could take out Agenda and make Meeting - Announcements, Material, Votes and Disposition. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that we currently have Change Management Process/Meeting agenda/Announcement/Materials. She said that she we could add approximately 5 more characters to that. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she did not have a problem with removing Agenda. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we could have Meeting Announcements, Materials, Vote and Disposition. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that you could abbreviate those words and eliminate some of the characters. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that the character limitation is 70 maximum. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that to be clear, we could leave Meetings and Announcements and Vote Announcement and Disposition. Network Susan Lorence-Qwest said that Integra proposed adding Disclosure as a subcategory and wanted to understand because the Copper Retirements that Qwest proposed is a Disclosure. Susan asked if Integra was proposing that everything other than a Copper Retirement would go in there. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that if you are adding a subcategory of COPR it would work as its own subcategory. Sandie Tekavec-Qwest said Qwest's original proposal did include COPR. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that if we include COPR that will include a lot of the notices. She said that we could look at having Tech Pubs, COPR. She said that Integra proposed including STP and said that STP has a fairly low volume. Sandie Tekavec-Qwest said that there were only 16. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we were thinking that the rest would fit under Announcement. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if they could recommend the same thing for STP, Tandem and Homing and identify those in the subcategory full name. Susan Lorence-Qwest agreed. She said that we will not go forward with Disclosure, STP, Tandem and Homing. She said that we will eliminate Engineering, Meeting and keep COPR. Process Susan Lorence-Qwest said that Qwest originally proposed a MISC category until we settled on what the subcategories would be. Susan said that this would allow us time to review the hundreds of notices and assign them to the most appropriate category according to our guidelines. She said that the MISC category was not meant to be a permanent category but to allow us to review all notices. Susan said we may still have something that may be appropriate for this category and we don't want to remove. She said that we have proposed Bill, COLLO (Kim agreed), MTC and ORD. Susan said that with Ordering we thought that Ordering, Preorder and Provisioning would all be in one general subcategory. She we believe that generally when you send an Ordering notice there is overlap with Preorder and Installation. Susan said we thought with the enhanced capability it could be one general subcategory with the sub set underneath. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that would be a big folder. Sandie Tekavec-Qwest said she thought we were agreed to Ordering and Pre ordering and not to include Provisioning. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if the subcategory would be ORDR and that we could have the full name be Preorder and Ordering. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that would work. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that Migration and Conversion would follow under the Ordering subcategory. Kim Isaacs-Integra agreed as long as they could get the full name included. Brenda Bloemke-Comcast asked if there would be a subcategory name for Migrations and Conversions. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that the subcategory would be ORDR and the full name would show Pre Ordering, Ordering, Migrations and Conversions. Kim Isaacs-Integra said they proposed that Migrations would fit better in Provisioning and Installation but as long as it is identified in the pull down menu it would work. Susan Lorence-Qwest said there were only 4 Migration and Conversion notices in 2007. Sandie Tekavec-Qwest said that there were 15 Provisioning and Installations notices from 2007 forward. Susan Lorence-Qwest asked if Integra felt that Migrations would fit better in Provisioning and Installations. Kim Isaacs-Integra said yes. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that would work as long as we are specific. She said that we would have Pre Ordering, Ordering, as one and Provisioning, Installation and Migration as another. She said that for the SIG we could use SIGX or SING for the abbreviation. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that they preferred a letter on the end and X is fine. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we will add Contracts which will include Account Management and CSIE. Susan said that Qwest would like to propose, instead of having a separate category for Expedites and Escalations, that they would go under the Contract subcategory. Kim Isaacs-Integra agreed and would be noted in the full name. She said that is how they are coming across today. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that Listing would be a separate subcategory as LIST and Contracts would be CNTS. Susan said that the MCC volume is very low and asked if we could put them in the broad MISC category. She said that anything that is not a clean fit would go into MISC and that we struggled with having a small number of notices in a subcategory Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that as long as you identify it in the full name. She said that if we decide consciously to put something in a category and if we have enough categories, they don't object to the MISC category. Kim Isaacs-Integra agreed as long as the subcategory name identifies it and would be the same for process trials. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that will care for MCC, Expedites under Contacts and Process Trials and Tax will be under MISC. Susan said that LSOG would be a good category to add and said that when we do a release notice for IMA the correlating Level 2 notice would be under LSOG. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that would be great. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that there has been confusion with the new process for example on Collo Augment Form. She said that these changes are associated with the actual process and not a notification of the change to the product. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that was a good point. She said that if you go to the Wholesale page and look under CLEC local interconnection, there are 3 drop downs Products Services/Solutions and has all of the PCATs. She said that anything that notifies on any of those would be under a Product notice. Susan said that under business procedure (i.e. collo process) anything that falls under collo would then be given that subcategory. She said that Directory Listings would be the Directory Listings Providers business procedure. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that explanation helped because sometimes there are Product/Process Crossovers. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that sometimes they are not always put into CNLA where they should and is why we want to clean it up. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that we skipped over Contract and said she assumed Qwest did that because they have concerns on their proposed changes. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that when we send out a notice for a Negotiations Template or Amendment they are sent as a Process notice. Susan said that we are proposing to send them under a different overall category instead of Process. She said that some of them would come under Contract and under Contract we break out Commercial Agreement, Amendment, and Interrogatory. She said that we are proposing to separate process so that process is specific to business procedures and not to the notices associated Amendment updates, Negotiation Template, SGAT etc. Sandie Tekavec-Qwest said that they are non CMP notices that are guided by Regulatory. She said they do not apply to your individual ICA and we are wavering whether to put them. Brenda Bloemke-Comcast asked what is affected if they don't affect the individual ICA. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we were trying to keep those separate. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said the concern is that Regulatory is limited to Regulatory and is the result of some type of an order. She said that they were not amenable to having a subcategory of Regulatory with the changes that Qwest made to the Negotiations Template or Commercial Agreements under Regulatory. She said those are Qwest initiated changes and not the result of Regulatory proceedings that resulted in an order. Bonnie said that she did not object with these going in Contract as long they are not notices specific to the individual ICAs. Susan Lorence-Qwest agreed and that we were trying to get a clean way of identifying those and not keep them under Process. Susan said that we could look at some examples in the next call and tell you where they would fall going forward. Susan said thanked everyone and said that she will schedule another meeting. 1/21/09 Prod/Proc CMP Meeting Susan Lorence-Qwest stated that an adhoc meeting was held on 1/15/09. She said that Qwest took an action item to look at the search capabilities in CNLA for improvements. She said in that meeting, Integra agreed to review the categories and subcategories and send back a proposal. Susan said that we will be sending out a notification for an adhoc meeting in a week or so. 1/15/09 CMP Adhoc Meeting CNLA Categories and Sub Categories Attendees: Bonnie Johnson-Integra, Kim Isaacs-Integra, Joyce Bilow - McLeod, Brenda Bloemke-Comcast, Kasha Fauscett-Comcast, Lorianne Burke- XO, Doug Allen-AT&T, Susan Lorence-Qwest, Paulette Hauck-Qwest, Carrie Bell-Qwest, Judy DeRosier-Qwest, Lynn Stecklein-Qwest Susan Lorence-Qwest said that this started with a Level 2 notice Web update that went out on 11/24/08. We received some objections from Integra and held an adhoc call on 12/15/08. Susan said that in that meeting we agreed to retract the level 2 notice and issue a Level 4 CR PC121608-01 that will be presented in the January CMP meeting. Susan said that in the 12/15 meeting we talked about the categories and subcategories and it was suggested in the December ad hoc call that rather than going through all the notices in CNLA together, each CLEC that wanted to participate would take a category of notices, i.e., Network. Susan said that in Qwest's original proposal, in the Network Category, Qwest

proposed elimination of 2 sub-categories: Engineering and Meeting. Qwest also had proposed that Tech Pubs and Announcements would be retained and a new sub category Copper Retirement added. She said that Qwest had reviewed all notices and placed assigned them to existing/new sub categories. Susan said that a lot of the notices in CNLA were not appropriately placed in the right sub category and we wanted to make it easier to find the notifications. She said that based on volume, there may be sub categories that do not need to be retained. Notices categories that are most critical would be reviewed and the group would get back together in another meeting to review the suggestions that CLECs or Qwest come back with. Susan said that Qwest considered the volume in CNLA and when you click on the category, you can see the volume of notifications for each subcategory. She said that if you see there are only 1 or 2 notifications, they may not have to be reviewed. She asked if everyone wanted to come up with the list of categories/subcategories that need to be reviewed and assign those. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said she was not sure if she agreed with the proposal not to review those sub categories that only have a couple of notices. She suggested that we review those together because they don't contain the volume of some of the other categories. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we did not want to go through notice by notice with this large of a group. We can look at the category and sub category and based on work that Qwest has completed, see if CLECs agree with our proposal. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she is not certain that there was a lot that they agreed with from the last call. She said that Integra would be willing to provide comments on those that we don't go through notice by notice and how we feel about Qwest's proposal. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we could start with looking at CMP notices. There are currently 5 categories and we proposed that, due to their small volume of notices, three subcategories would be eliminated: Redesign, Distribution List and Change Requests. Susan said that in the 12/15 meeting, Integra indicated that they wanted more categories and asked if anyone else had any further suggestions. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she had not had an opportunity to review the categories any further. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that her recommendation for CMP notices for additional review would be on Escalation, Oversight and those requiring a vote and asked where they would fall now. Susan Lorence-Qwest said of the two subcategories being proposed – CMP Process and Meetings, they would fall under CMPP (CMP Process). She said that Process is for anything that does not fit under a Meeting. She said that if you look at escalations, we have had around 45 in CMP. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that the problem in CNLA specific to CMP Process, you have to scroll through every page to find the escalation because there is no way to search for a particular notice. She said that you are going to make the folder bigger, there is no way to search on a notice number or key word. Kim said that this would make the categories more inclusive to find things. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that she was not aware that some of these categories were used that frequently, such as looking for specific notifications on an Escalation, Vote Required, Oversight and Prioritization. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that maybe Prioritization and Voting could be in one folder. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that if we created an Oversight subcategory, the related meeting notices would go into that category. She said that rather than separating them and having meetings in one subcategory, the related ad hoc meeting notices should be in that grouping, Oversight, Escalation, and that is what she meant by expanding them. She said that Integra is in the CNLA all the time and finds it difficult to find notices. She appreciates Qwest bringing this up because they agree it needs some work. Integra thinks the Qwest recommendation will make it harder rather than easier. Susan Lorence-Qwest said she has captured their concern and asked if other CLECs on the call agree that meetings should be put in a subcategory with Escalation or Oversight vs. having a separate Meeting folder. Joyce Bilow-Paetec said that she agreed with Integra and that it would be easier. She said that sometimes it takes longer to search than reading the documentation. Brenda Bloemke-Comcast agreed. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that Qwest agreed that it can be difficult to find things because of where they are today. She said that her question is that from a CMP category, we could expand the subcategories to Escalation, Oversight, Prioritization, and Vote notices. She asked if we wanted to assign these three additional subcategories or are there others needed. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that Integra could take that CMP category to see if there should be additional ones. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that she did not think there were additional subcategories. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we have Escalations, Oversight and Vote related notices. She said that there may be an issue on the notices requiring a vote. She said that there could be an escalation requiring a vote and what she is hearing would be an overlap. She said that a notice requiring a vote could be associated with an escalation. What Qwest is trying to do is make the categories clean so you can be clear on where to find something. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that if she is looking for anything that has to do with an escalation, she would look in the escalation folder. She said that with Oversight, there aren't any votes. She asked if changes to the CMP document would be an appropriate subcategory. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that the only thing that she could see would be go into Oversight is an Announcement that we have an Oversight issue, a request for names submitted for oversight membership, or a resolution for Oversight. Susan said that in the case of CMP Document changes, those go with a Change Request. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked where adhoc meetings would go. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that an adhoc meeting would be all the meetings that have been established but if the group wants them to fit with the a specific topic, i.e., Vote related notices vs. escalation, that would have to be made very clear. She said that it should be clear where to look without putting a lot of documentation on the page. She said that if Integra is saying that a meeting vote would go with Escalations, we need to rethink the Vote subcategory. She said changes to the CMP Document could be a subcategory and you may only have 10 notices in there. She asked how someone would really find a CMP doc change notice. Would you look for those notices there or would they go to the CMP change request site and look for notices that have a CM designation. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that it would be ideal if in CNLA they had the ability to use a search key and get all the notices for a particular subject. She said that today they have to go through many pages to get what you are looking for. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that you almost have to find what you are looking before you find what you are looking for. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that there is no way to search besides guessing where a notice could have been under and when. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she could get the notice number from the history log but it depends on what level is. She said that if you could get the process notification number and be able to put that in would be great. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that would require a significant change to the CNLA to change the search capability. She said that the Qwest proposal was to change the categories and subcategories to make them more usable and not make changes to the search capability. She said that we can take a look at their request to see if there is any possibility there. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that we should go through the categories and assign them. She said she was not sure that anyone has any extra time and wanted to make sure that all CLECs on the call want to participate in this effort. Susan Lorence-Qwest agreed that it takes a lot of time and analysis. She said that we don't want to go through the process again until we know what is desired. Susan asked if anyone else besides Integra wanted to take a category and determine if what Qwest has proposed is appropriate. Kim Isaacs-Integra volunteered to review the proposal and send something back to Qwest. Kim said she knows how they could be organized to make it easier and could send back a proposal. Brenda Bloemke-Comcast asked if Integra was going to look at all categories. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that she would review all categories. She said that she receives all the notices and knows how they come in and how she sends them out. She said that she has a method based on the current categories. Susan Lorence-Qwest asked that Integra use what Qwest has proposed as a starting point. Brenda Bloemke-Comcast said that she could take a category if Integra wanted to split them up. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that she would take the 1st shot and send back a proposal. Susan Lorence-Qwest asked if Integra had a timeframe so that we could schedule another call to review her proposal. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that she would be able to provide the information in a couple of weeks. Susan Lorence-Qwest that we will take the suggestion back to our web team regarding the search on the notice number. She said that capability is there once you have the date of the notice from the history log; you can go to that month and year. She said that you might have to scroll through 2 or 3 screens. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that you don't always find the notice in that month even with the notice number. She said that you could go through 4 screens and not find the notice in that month. Paulette Hauck-Qwest asked if when they are looking for notices, is it because they don't have them? She said that she is looking into a large project that would give wholesale customers space in a Qwest server. She said that all notices would reside in a server and customers would be able to search for them when they wanted. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that would be wonderful but they subscribe to notices for 7 different companies and not sure that is what they are looking for. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said that we will continue to share information on the project and thought that this historical file would be helpful. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she has at times had to request a cutoff to her notices so that her mailbox does not get full. She said that if she is looking for a notice, she will go to the Qwest web site. Joyce Bilow-Paetec said that she would like to be able to search by a letter, text, or word, and it would bring up all notices associated with it. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that there is a search function but does not necessarily come up with just the letters. Joyce Bilow-Paetec said that she can do that if she knows what year it is but spends too much time looking for it than she should. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that sounds like a huge change but we would take it back as

a general question. Kim Isaacs-Integra asked if that change was as huge as this change by moving everything around. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that it sounds like a bigger change because it is taking all the history and putting it into a bank to be able to search for "collo", for example. She said that every notice associated with "collo" would come up. She said it sounds like a huge Google search. She said she thought that taking the time to put them into correct subcategories would be easier than putting them into a huge database and expanding the search capability. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that other ILECs have search functions that makes it easier. Joyce Bilow-Paetec said that this search would have to be by year because it minimizes your search. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that you already have the search functionality that gives you everything and that is part of the problem. She said that when they do a search in Wholesale, it comes up with things that aren't even on the Qwest website like regulatory information. She said it sounds like you have already a search engine database and depending on how it is based, you could have it search only in the CNLA. She said that if you have big warehouse of data and if Qwest can provide them with the functionality, they wouldn't need the rearrangement of subcategories. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we can look at that internally. She asked if we were still proposing that Kim review the categories or did they want Qwest to look at the search capability first. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that we can do it in parallel. She asked if Paulette knew if the search capability and functionality is out of the scope of what we normally do. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that we can take a look at something like that but with this project, we were not looking at changing the search functionality. She said that this project is more to address the categories and subcategories and to eliminate categories that were not being used. She said that she thought that the level of effort with something like adding expanded key word search would probably be out of scope. Carrie asked for more information on the example previously identified where the notice was in the wrong month. Carrie wanted to determine if it was an error so that she could correct it. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that it was not an error. She said that it was a process notice dated 7/10/04 and it should have been in July, She said that she could not remember the details but the number date is not always in that month and it was her understanding that was by design. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that the notice should be in CNLA by month. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that between the Document review site, the history log, and CNLA, she has always found it in the correct month. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that maybe it was Document review. Judy DeRosier-Qwest said that when Qwest issues a response to comments, we use a new notice number, but the responses are posted under the original notice number. Judy said that the notice that is issued will tell you where to find it. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that you should be able to find the notice in CNLA if you have the date. Kim Isaacs-Integra said that even when you have the date and go into the CNLA, i.e., for March 2008, there are 300 notices for that month and you still have to page through the entire month which is very frustrating. Carrie Bell-Qwest said that we can look at providing 1 full page with all of the notices so you don't have to scroll. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that the volume of notices on CNLA is decreasing and we now generally have 60-70 per month and very rarely go over 100 anymore. Susan said that what Carrie is proposing would eliminate that frustration. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we will schedule a meeting in a couple of weeks and take back some questions on search capability. She said that we will look at improvements to CNLA that would take you directly to a notification - or a broader search capability like a key word or a date. She said that Kim will look at proposing some modifications to the categories and subcategories that have been proposed. 12/15/08 CMP Adhoc Meeting CMP Adhoc Meeting CNLA Subject Line Attendees: Bonnie Johnson-Integra, Julia Redman-Carter-McLeod, Brenda Bloemke-Comcast, Kasha Fauscett-Comcast, Wendy Chapman-Neustar, Susan Lorence-Qwest, Paulette Hauck-Qwest, Carrie Bell-Qwest, Judy DeRosier-Qwest, Lynn Stecklein-Qwest Susan Lorence-Qwest said that documents for this meeting can be found on the Wholesale Calendar including current volumes as of last Friday that will help us go through the original matrix. She said that this call stems from a Level 2 notice change to eliminate or replace existing web functionality that Qwest sent out 11/24. She said that in that L2 notice we were proposing to correct and improve the notification categories in CNLA and also to improve how we send out notifications via our mail out system. She said that we wanted to provide a distinct category and subcategory so that you can locate them in the CNLA historical information. She said that we reviewed the volume of notices in CNLA and it is not very reflective of what categories they are placed in. She said that we want to go through and review every notice and re-post them to the correct sub category on a historical basis. She said that when the notice went out on 11/24, Integra had concerns about what we were changing and requested that we change this to a level 4. We requested this adhoc meeting to see if we can come to an agreement and hope that everyone will see that what we are doing is logical and that the true objective of this change is to improve your ability to locate notifications by category and would like the category to be more reflective of content. She said that as we go through the matrix we can touch on some of the questions that Integra has raised. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that have they noted their objections. She said that Qwest said that they would like to move forward with a Level 2 and that the task at hand is bigger than that and will require some collaboration. She said that she thought the purpose of this meeting per the CMP process is to determine if the Level of this notice should be different than a Level 2. She said that they don't disagree that the website needs some kind of help and just to pull up notices takes a lot of time. She said that they were thinking of links for the notices so that the load time is not as long as it is. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that is a different type of change than what we are proposing. She said that when we go through the list of volumes and compare to what we are proposing we hope you see that we are not making that significant of a change. She said that is why we want to go through the changes and if there is not a way to resolve we can retract and issue a Level 4 CR. Susan said that we are proposing they are 5 subcategories today's and if you did a review of the notices 2 are assigned to re-design and 3 of them assigned to distribution list and what we are proposing that we only keep 2 of those subcategories - 1 is specific to adhoc meetings and 1 that is more process. She said we found to keep the category of change request is deceiving and that there could be process notices or adhoc meetings associated with a CR and it would be confusing on where to look. She said that we are proposing is that if the notice is specific to an adhoc meeting whether it is a CR or any kind of meeting it would go in the MEET subcategory and everything else would go under PROCESS if it was a change to disposition request, an escalation or anything in the CMP category that is not a meeting. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she does not agree and it makes it more difficult. She said that she does not disagree that you need a separate category for adhoc meetings. She said that she believed that the subcategories for the CNLA in most cases need to be expanded not reduced. She said if you are trying to add clarity and to find things it needs to be expanded. Paulette Hauck-Qwest asked if Integra was referring to all notices or just CMP notices. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she commented before that she disagreed with a miscellaneous category because it would be a catchall. She said that beside the Regulatory issue, her greatest concern is that by reducing the subcategories, Qwest is making it more difficult to identify notices. She would have a tendency to go the other way. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that if you look at the list there are 3 Distribution List notices and 2 redesign notices. She said that we are not going to be sending any more redesign notices and the distribution list is 3 and if you look at CRs She said that we could not come up with a more logical breakdown than Process and Meet categories and there was no sense in keeping those 3. She said that we will take note that you would like them expanded. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she has not taken the time to go through the notices which is why she wants to make this a collaborative effort and look at the notices to see what the CLECs think. She said that with the Level 2 notice there is no opportunity to do that. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that the next category is Contract and Qwest is proposing that we delete the Amendment and Interrogatory and leave Announcement. She said that the volume of notices did not warrant the subcategories that are there. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that in her objection she said that there are specific notice provisions in the ICA that are required for Contract notices that have an impact to a CLEC. She said if Qwest chooses to use this process then you are free to do so as long as you are following the provisions of the ICA. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said that from a Contract notice perspective many of those are individual customer contracts and those kinds of contracts would never be in CNLA and from a search process you would never see those. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked what would be sent out in this type of category. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said that these are very generic i.e. putting in new template on the website or and Out of Region change such as changing our name etc. anything specific to a Contract ICA is not a CNLA topic. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that in CNLA if you select Contract notices, the last notice we sent out was August of this year and was a CPAP filing Exhibit K and B and the one before that was a ROC notice. The volume is very small with 19 notices. Julia Redman-Carter-McLeod asked for clarification on Interrogatory. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that the last notice we sent out in this category was March of 2005. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said that most of the Interrogatory are of a very generic nature. She said that most of them are from the Commission asking us to respond to some data requests. She said that those letters are proprietary and would never be on CNLA. Julia Redman-Carter-McLeod said that she would like to see this remain as is. She said that when she sees Amendments come through she (12/22/08 Comments received from McLeod) knows she needs to go look at it. However, she said that when she sees something as Interrogatory she knows that Qwest is looking for timely response or answer. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said that

through the notification process the letter will still say CONTRACT and will have Interrogatory on it. She said that it is not going to be filed on CNLA as Interrogatory. Julia Redman-Carter-McLeod said that she understands that the (12/22/08 Comments received from McLeod) notice you send via my ICA because of Interrogatory is based on privacy issues. She said she is trying to figure out the ones that are a part of this project that are provisioning issues and under CNLA. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said that the notice from 2005 notice shouldn't be on CNLA. She said 3 years we did not completely understand how we should post things on CNLA and that we would not be posted to CNLA today. She said that when the notices come into her systems today she has could not recall putting Interrogatory on CNLA. Julia Redman-Carter-McLeod said that is what she wants to understand is that break out (12/22/08 Comments received from McLeod) of interrogatory and Amendments broken out is that Announcements tells her the notice is something that she should be aware of. Whereas, the Interrogatory is where you are asking me a question and I need to respond. She wants to make a distinction between the two. If Qwest is telling me that there will not be an Interrogatory sent under Announcements and that the likelihood of Interrogatory ever be sent out in CNLA is nil then she can understand Announcement category better. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said that a Contract generic Announcement would say CONT ANNC. She said if there was an Interrogatory it would say CONT and there would not be a subcategory and would not be on CNLA. Julia Redman-Carter-McLeod and that (12/22/08 Comments received from McLeod) she wants to be able to identify the notices to which she needs to respond such as an interrogatory. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said that if you don't see a subcategory in the future you know that letter won't be on CNLA and is unique to you or a CLEC and is not public domain. Julia Redman-Carter-McLeod asked that if the subcategory of Interrogatory were to be removed there would never be issued from Qwest any Interrogatory that would need a response within a short period of time in CNLA. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said there would never be an Interrogatory that said would say CONT ANNC and would never come to you that way. She said that there are notices that are sent out that don't get posted to CNLA and most of them are for privacy reasons. She said that these will never have a subcategory and that will be an indication to you this is not a CNLA letter. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that we have only gotten through the 1st 2 categories and that's why this needs to be a collaborative effort. She said that even if we agreed on 11 notices and determined on what they were and if they were CLEC specific they probably should not be there. She said that there needs to be a subcategory for Qwest's template changes. She said that the Qwest Template is not a contract and appears to be with the current CNLA. She said that by putting everything into a General category will make the search more difficult because they will have to go through all the notices. She said that she doesn't agree with the concept that reducing the number of subcategories makes it easier or more efficient to locate a type of notice. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that with 19 notices under the Contract category under Announcements is about as efficient as trying to look under Amendments and then look under Interrogatory. She said that we are trying to make the point that we want to make it easier and so you don't have to look under multiple places. Susan said that we are not looking to make any changes under the Forecast General Category. She said that there are 43 from the last 5 to 7 years and General had Announcements and Meetings. Susan said that if you look under Meeting it's really seem to fit under Announcements. She said that the last time we sent one out was for the mini forum for provisioning and there were other repair forums back to 2001-2002 She said that we thought we would put these under one category because we have not been using this category lately. She said that if everyone would prefer to keep it as is we can look at that. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she would like to look at those Announcements to see what the subject matter is and perhaps expand the category. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we did not think there would be much interest or desire to have a lot of resources from Qwest and the CLECs reviewing and analyzing all notices back to 2002. to do that. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that one of her concerns with deleting categories relates to systems. She said that she does not believe even if the system retires you should eliminate that subcategory for historical reasons. She said that she knows where to find the notice and deleting the category is a concern and that Integra would have to go back historically and review. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that for Systems we are keeping Billing, CEMR and proposing to delete EXACT. She said that there are only 10 notices and after your comment we can keep. She said there are only 2 notices and thought we could move to archived systems and not keep that category on a going forward basis. She said that with IMA EDI and GUI there are 3 categories today and you could not depend on where to find those notices today because many of them cross EDI and GUI. She said MEDIAAC was going to be kept and Other was going to be changed to Miscellaneous. She said that there were 330 of those but we were going to review to see if they would fit somewhere else. She said that we were going to keep Premise. There we no notices for Product database for Co-Provider and no Raw Loop Tool notices. We were going to keep Sate and Telis. We are deleting those with no notices and then make IMA more usable so that you don't have to flip through 3 categories. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that the System Other category has more notices than any other category and that there should not be an Other Category and would be opposed to a Miscellaneous category. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that if you look at the Other category there are scheduled QORA, scheduled maintenance and those would be associated with a specific system. She said that we thought we would put those in the correct category. She said that we were going to put QORA new in the new subcategory. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if there was going to a new Scheduled Maintenance category or would they stay in their respective systems. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that if there was a QORA or IMA they would stay in that system. She said that alot of them are related to IMA and we do have some LFACs AN Community name update which we thought should go under Miscellaneous but if the desire is to create a subcategory we can. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that would be their preference. She asked about the Product category and why is Qwest adding collo and condensing others. She said that products should be all of your products. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that the reason we called out collo is because several years ago we realized we had a few external documents that were under Product and business procedures document. She said that the documentation team went through an effort to break them out and make them more specific to the type of process/product under collo that was being addressed in that document. She said that we believe that there was such a volume of those it made sense to have a separate subcategory specific to Collo. She said that if you look at the product/process drop down menu there is a big grouping of them and we thought that we should call those out uniquely because of the volume. She said that we wanted to create a new category called CML solutions because a lot of notices go out for QPP and QLSP and get into the Miscellaneous category. She said that we wanted to breakout resale and review what is there to a make it more usable. She said that another proposal is to create another subcategory for ICB and Contract notices. She said that on the volume sheet there are 1496 notices and said that she was not sure if that was a good view. She said that at the history it seems kind of a catchall. She said that we think we can improve and be more specific to products/services that are resold and take out Contract notices and put in the ICB subcategory. She said for resale you will not have to look at 400 - 500 Contract notices. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she does not disagree and there are changes that Qwest is making that she does not agree with. She said that she does not know why Qwest is eliminating the UNE category. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we understand your concern and that we could keep it but we have to review it because there a lot of things that have been placed there that are aren't UNE. She said there is QLSP, QPP, TRO and Commercial Agreements we could keep and just review historical files. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that UNE should stay. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we are fine with retaining UNE. Paulette Hauck-Qwest said that we are not writing UNE notices and that you will not see these going forward. Susan Lorence-Qwest agreed and we were thinking we could move UNEs to a subcategory but if the preference is to keep UNE we can. She said we did not believe the changes we are proposing especially after you look at the volume in some of these areas that we were making substantial changes. She said that if there is still a desire to meet as a team and look at these collaboratively we can do that. We were taking a huge step to improve the CNLA without taking every one's time. Julia Redman-Carter-McLeod said that she wanted a clarification on UNE as the example - Qwest said that they (12/22/08 Comments received from McLeod) would leave as a subcategory because they don't anticipate any new activity. She asked when Qwest says they want to delete that subcategory will you take the existing information and move it to a UNE archived or was the plan to merge the UNE notices into something else or another existing category. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we were going to merge under Interconnection. She said that once you go through those that are under LIS interconnection and put them into the correct subcategory that was identified we thought UNE would fall into that. She said if the preference is to keep UNE as a subcategory knowing that it is not going to grow but that it is good for historical purposes we can do that. We would still need to review and clean up what has been assigned there. Julia Redman-Carter-McLeod said that she liked the idea (12/22/08 Comments received from McLeod) of archiving UNE for example, if we know there will not be any UNEs notices for CNLA in the future. She said that though it would be a category that they would not expect to see CNLA notices but they would still be able to access the category on a historical basis. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we were not going to remove the notices and that the notices will be there but we were improving where you would find them. Susan said that what she is hearing that we don't move

forward with this and that we issue a CR and schedule additional meetings. She said that we need to review this list and review by category and have everyone look at the historical files and come back with proposed categories. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she has voiced concerns on the changes and that this needs to be a level 4 CR. She said that the CMP document says we need to get concurrence, She said that the CR should be issued and that we can meet collaboratively and discuss. She said that if Qwest wants to send something new as a Level 3 we can see if we agree and that they could comment. Bonnie then said that we should probably start with the Level 4. Susan Lorence-Qwest asked how everyone else felt on the call. Julia Redman-Carter said she was leaning towards the level 4 and is concerned about the time involved in this effort. (12/22/08 Comments received from Integra) She said because of the time and discussions she better understands why the proposed changes regarding Amendments and Interrogatory. However, without a similar discussion for those categories that she wants to understand better – such as what categories are changing, what fits into which categories, and what will impact processes, she may not know where to find things. So that she knows where things are, she wants to be involved in archiving and understand the rationale as to why we are moving things around if those modifications are made. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she agrees that the level 4 makes the best sense. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we will retract the level 2. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that we can work with the CLECs that want to be involved and each take a category Susan Lorence –Qwest said that the notice will be retracted and the level 4 will be issued.

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC032409-1	Expedites and Escalation - Change to remove UDF Product	06/09/2009 Development	Wholesale ProdProc	Ordering	UDF

**Director
Originator
Owner
CRPM**

Originating Company: Qwest Corporation

Description of Change

Qwest sent a level 1 notice PROS.03.02.09.F.06070.Expedites_EscalationsV55 to sync up documentation with the Core UDF PCAT for the purpose of removing UDF from the product list in the Escalation/Expedite business procedure. A CLEC change to disposition request was received on 3/13 and was discussed in the 3/18 CMP Monthly Meeting. In the discussion because of CLEC Comments, Qwest agreed to retract the original notice and issue a change request to remove UDF from the product list.

Status History

Date	Action	Description
06/17/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the June ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
06/09/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Development
06/08/2009	Communicator Issued	PROS.CNTS.06.08.09.F.06470.Expedites_EscalationV57
05/20/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the May ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
04/15/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
04/15/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the April CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
03/25/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR acknowledged
03/24/2009	CR Submitted	CR submitted

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

6/17/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said that the level 4 announced on 6/8/09 and will become effective on 7/23/09.
5/20/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said that the level 4 notice will be sent out 6/1/09 with a tentative effective date of 7/16/09.
4/15/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Joan Wells-Qwest said that this was presented last month and a request was made to change the level. Joan said that we are correcting the expedite PCAT to remove UDF as an Expedite offer and to synch it up with the main PCAT that does not accommodate expedites. Joan said that there are no provisions or rates for expedites with the new Commercial Agreements. She said that Qwest wants to synch up the method and move forward with correcting the expedite PCAT. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that Integra requested that the level 1 be retracted. Bonnie said that if Qwest wanted to make this change, it is a limitation to a product, not a correction and they don't agree with this change on any level. Bonnie said that Qwest said that all products are included in the expedite list. Bonnie said they believe that for those CLECs that have an expedite agreement that refers to the PCAT, Qwest is making changes to the terms in their ICA. She said she hoped Qwest was reviewing the Arizona order to determine if Arizona specific language is needed for this. Bonnie said that when Qwest submits the redline change, they will be commenting. Joan Wells-Qwest said that she appreciated their comments and that the contract language does refer to the product/process that are pre-approved in the PCAT. She said that she didn't have the history on the initial implementation of the expedite PCAT but did understand from the product managers that UDF is ordered through the Commercial Agreement and is not part of the ICA. She said that the Commercial Agreement does not accommodate expedites for UDF and this is why this is being done. She said that we have not had any expedites on UDF and that was not sure if you could order UDF on a standard ICA and that you have to have a Commercial Agreement. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that Dark Fiber is still available in some cases under the ICA. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that (4/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC) she wanted clarification in general on when they have information in an ICA that cross references to a PCAT, i.e. expedite, amendments what is Qwest's position. Is it Qwest's position that when the PCAT or tech pub change, Qwest can do that without an amendment and just with a level 4 CMP process. Julia asked if it was Qwest's position that they can unilaterally change (4/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC) material terms without their agreement in the process. Mark Coyne-Qwest asked if PAETEC was referring to the cross reference from an agreement. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that she was referring to an ICA, not Commercial, but a regulated agreement. Julia said that she is questioning in general and was using the UDF /expedite as the example. She said that (4/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC) in expedite amendment the language cross references the applicable items that are listed in the PCAT. Julia said that she believed the items in the PCAT at the time the amendment was signed are what they are. She said that those items are material terms that can't be change unilaterally by Qwest without CLECs having an opportunity to challenge and agree. She asked if in a situation where there is something that Qwest wants to change in the PCAT, does Qwest feel that issuing a level 4 in CMP is sufficient to make the change and does Qwest feel it is binding whether CLECs agree or disagree. Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we will follow up on this question and provide a response in the minutes. Mark said that the product/process SME would look at that before making the change and would get that agreement. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that she was trying to understand if this (4/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC) type of changes that impact material terms in the ICAs is something that goes through CMP or is it some other separate process. Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we understand PAETEC's question and will provide a formal response in the

minutes. Joan Wells-Qwest said the expedite PCAT does refer to their terms and conditions in the ICA. She said that if their ICA specifically states that you can expedite UDF, then we can't change the PCAT. She said that we can change the PCAT overall but if you have that language you would not be affected. Joan said that contract language is not specific down to the product level. Mark Coyne-Qwest said that generally speaking anything that we change in the PCAT can't override the ICA. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that their ICAs can't be changed unless they have an agreement in writing and both parties have to sign it. Julia said that if there is an amendment (4/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC) such as the expedites Amendment, stating how this is treated etc. or identifying, the products this applies to are listed in the PCAT. Julia said that if Qwest changes that list in the PCAT, they have to amend their agreement to incorporate that change in the PCAT for that product. She said that in the past, Qwest has said they are going to change the PCAT via the CMP level 4 process and that the ICA is automatically amended and they are bound to it. She said that she wants to understand Qwest's position going forward. She said that with the tech pub changes they have that cross referenced in their agreement and they also have language that says that material terms can not be unilaterally changed so it can't be changed without agreement by both parties. Julia said that they want clarification on Qwest's position about changes that are documented where Qwest has unilateral control over a document that reference material terms of the ICA in their agreement. She asked if it was Qwest's position they make these changes this through CMP or that Qwest must amend the agreement to effectuate the changes. She said that she keeps going back and forth on different pieces and wants to understand the process. She said that she is negotiating ICAs and this is a big deal as to what they are going to allow to reference or cross reference in the ICA. Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we understand PAETEC's clarification and will provide a response

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC052609-1	Grandfather Radio Carrier Listings	06/17/2009 Presented	Wholesale ProdProc		Resale

Director
Originator
Owner
CRPM

Originating Company: Qwest Corporation

Description of Change

Qwest will be grandfathering the Mobile Radio Service Listing (USOC – L96) and the Mobile Unit Number Listing (USOC – LMS) in Arizona, Montana and New Mexico.

Status History

Date	Action	Description
06/26/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
06/17/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the June ProdProc CMP meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
05/27/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR acknowledged
05/26/2009	CR Submitted	CR submitted

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

6/17/09 ProdProc CMP Meeting Cindy Schwartze-Qwest said that Qwest will be grandfathering the Mobile Radio Service Listing (USOC – L96) and the Mobile Unit Number Listing (USOC – LMS) in Arizona, Montana and New Mexico. Cindy said that there are 43 wholesale customers with the L96 USOC and no customers with LMS. She said that the implementation is scheduled for September 1, 2009 and no sunset date has been determined. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if any CLECs had this product. Cindy Schwartze-Qwest said there are no Wholesale customers. There are 43 Wholesale accounts with a handful of wireless customers. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if Qwest contacts them separately. Cindy Schwartze-Qwest said that the notification will go out but we won't be contacting them because we are just grandfathering. She said that we won't be moving the customers off because there is no sunset date.

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC060509-1	LIS PCAT Changes	06/17/2009 Presented	Wholesale ProdProc		LIS/Interconnect

**Director
Originator
Owner
CRPM**

Originating Company: Qwest Corporation

Description of Change

Submitting Level 4 changes to LIS PCAT associated with changes that were originally submitted as a Level 2 and including additional updates. Qwest description: LIS Mid Span Meet POI Subsection, the existing process was expanded upon and additional clarity and detail were added. Qwest description: Trunking Subsection, the existing process not previously documented was added regarding the TCIC numbering range as well as providing additional clarity and detail to existing documentation Qwest description: The existing process relating to the local Exchange Routing Guide (LERG) was added which was previously not documented. Qwest description: LIS to AT Switch(es) Subsection, the existing Single Point of Presence (SPOP) process was added which was previously not documented.

Status History

Date	Action	Description
06/17/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the June ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
06/17/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
06/08/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR Acknowledged
06/05/2009	CR Submitted	CR Submitted

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

6/17/09 ProdProc CMP Meeting Sandy Stulen-Qwest said that Qwest is submitting Level 4 LIS PCAT changes as a result of changes that were originally submitted as a Level 2. She said that we may be adding additional items in the process of reviewing the changes. She said that the original Level 2 changes that will now be a Level 4 are: LIS Mid Span Meet POI Subsection, Trunking Subsection, process relating to the (LERG) and the LIS to AT Switch Subsection, (SPOP). Sandy said that will be looking at some other changes to determine if they should be a level 3 or 4. Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked if Qwest was planning to let the level 2s expire before Qwest submits the Level 4 changes so there won't be overlapping notices. Susan Lorence-Qwest said that we want to close out the level 2's that we received approval to move forward on from the March meeting. Susan said that we will get those submitted and implemented. Susan said that a final notice will go out to communicate what is and isn't going forward and then we will start addressing the level 4s. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that would be great to let the level 2's work their course and then submit the level 4's.

Attachment E – Proposed Modifications to CMP Framework

- Status of Request for CMP Oversight Review regarding Section 2.6 of the CMP Document
- PC060909-1CM Update Section 2.6 of the CMP Document to remove obsolete language
- PC050409-1CM Increased clarity in Qwest-initiated proposed documentation changes, including avoiding overlapping notices and modifying notices if an overlapping change is unavoidable
- PC060209-1CM Update Section 5.8 of the CMP Document to add a new CR status of “Crossover”

Open CR - Detail

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC060909-1CM	Update Section 2.6 of the CMP Document to remove obsolete language	06/17/2009 Presented	Wholesale ProdProc		

Director

Originator Williams, Mike

Owner Williams, Mike

CRPM Stecklein, Lynn

Originating Company: Qwest Corporation

Description of Change

The CMP Oversight Committee recommended a change to Section 2.6 of the CMP document as part of the resolution to an Oversight issue submitted by Integra. Full details of the Oversight Committee discussion are available at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/escdisp.html>. Qwest is seeking to modify Section 2.6 of the CMP document to remove obsolete language that refers to the PID Administration Group which is no longer in existence. Revised wording is attached.

Status History

Date	Action	Description
06/17/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the June ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment E in the Distribution Package
06/17/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
06/16/2009	Communicator Issued	CMPPR.CMPP.06.16.09.F.06505.Notification_PID_Request
06/11/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR Acknowledged
06/09/2009	CR Submitted	CR Submitted

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

6/17/09 ProdProc CMP Meeting

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that the Oversight Committee met on 6/3/09 and the minutes can be found on the Qwest Wholesale website. Mark said that as a result of that meeting it was agreed that a notice referencing Integra's PID request would be sent out and that Qwest would issue a CR to update the language in section 2.6 and that further discussion would take place on the language. Mark said that the notification went out yesterday and the CR was submitted by Qwest to address the language in Section 2.6.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that she wanted to say that meeting minutes from that call and her comments support (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) THAT QWEST IS FREE TO SUBMIT ANY CR QWEST WISHES TO SUBMIT and that there was concurrence with that BUT NOT A RECOMMENDATION TO DO THAT. THE MEETING MINUTES IMPLIED THAT THE CLEC AGREED WITH QWEST'S POSITION THAT 2.6 NEED TO BE UPDATED, WHICH WAS NOT THE CASE. However, Bonnie said that Integra's position is that they feel no change was needed to the document.

Mike Williams-Qwest said that Qwest's position is that the PID Administration Group does not exist and has not existed for years. He said Qwest has no obligation left under Section 2.6 because there is no PID Administration Group. Mike said the Qwest CR simply removes the PID Administration Group language and replaces it with generic language. (6/24/09Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) MIKE SAID HE UNDERSTANDS INTEGRA DISAGREES WITH QWEST'S INTERPRETATION. He said it represents the intent of parties, in considering Section 2.6, to facilitate communication if a PID question arises. He said the CMP process was not designed to handle PID issues but Qwest recognizes there may be items that spill back and forth to and from CMP. When that happens, notification will get distributed. No matter what you call it, the parties in CMP have access to communication. Making this change allows us agree to disagree on why we're revising the language or on what happens in any given interaction while still facilitating the distribution of PID-related notices and communications as intended, overall, by Section 2.6.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said they (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) ARE NOT REFUSING TO REVIEW THE CHANGES AND will look at the change and consider the change. She said they believe the CMP document anticipated a successor and Integra doesn't believe the PID Administration Group is a defined group. She said that it could be any group of people REVIEWING A PID not A that particular group. She SAID WHILE A PARTICULAR GROUP OF PEOPLE NO LONGER EXIST SHE disagrees that the PID group is no longer operating. Bonnie asked if they should send comments back to CMP or Mark.

Susan Lorence-Qwest said that with a CR there is an option for a call. We could schedule an ad hoc call to review the language (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) IF THE GROUP FELT THERE WAS A NEED FOR THE AD HOC CALL. BUT IF ANYONE HAS COMMENTS OR any proposed changes TO THEIR REDLINE IT should be sent to Qwest.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said they would like an ad hoc call because there are fundamental issues (6/24/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) UNDERLYING THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE CHANGES that they need clarified before they can comment on the redline.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we will schedule an ad hoc meeting prior to any changes to the redline being submitted.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said she needs to understand how the process works and what the PID group looks like etc. to determine if she would agree to the language Qwest is proposing and that we need an adhoc meeting before the redline.

Mark Coyne-Qwest asked if there were any other questions or comments.

E-mail received from Integra 6/16/09

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that Qwest SAID IT merely lifted the PID Administration group language but there are other changes besides than just deleting that language.

Mike Williams-Qwest said it was to make it more readable and to make it fit with the remaining language. It was our sincere intent not to create anything new and to determine how section 2.6 could go forward.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC asked that the State Commissions be invited to the ad hoc meeting.

Liz Balvin-Covad said that she agreed with having an ad hoc meeting. Liz said they have a fundamental concern when someone is not proactively looking at the documentation and that the PID administration group no longer exists. She said she thought that Qwest undertook some time ago and was surprised this wasn't triggered at that time.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that with the infrequency of using this section for changing PID etc and it hasn't been looked. We knew it would be difficult to change that language and it hasn't occurred until now.

Qwest, as you know from our earlier email, we disagree with several of your points. We ask that Qwest ensure that all of the email correspondence, including proposals, are posted as part of the record of this oversight escalation.

Bonnie

Bonnie J. Johnson | Director Carrier Relations
bjjohnson@integratelecom.com

From: Cmp, Escalation [mailto:cmpesc2@qwest.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2009 1:45 PM

To: Johnson, Bonnie J.; 'allendm@att.com'; 'ebalvin@Covad.COM'; 'Brenda_Bloemke@cable.comcast.com'; 'Cox, Rod'; Coyne, Mark; 'Carolee Hall'; 'shelley.e.jones@state.or.us'; 'Quintana,Becky'; 'Redman-Carter, Julia'

Cc: 'cmpesc@qwest.com'; Williams, Mike; Isaacs, Kimberly D.; Urevig, Rita; Denney, Douglas K.; 'charity_pelack@cable.comcast.com'

Subject: RE: Change Management Notice: GN: CMP - Oversight Review Submission

Bonnie,

In regard to the points made in each of your paragraphs below:

1) Qwest will utilize Julia Redman-Carter's version of the draft PID notice with the addition of the specific date of the CMP Oversight meeting as it was the most supported version of the notice among the responders. The PID notice will be distributed today, June 16, 2009. The final version is attached.

2) Qwest removed the CR reference from the notice. It was simply a way to tie the CMP Oversight meeting and the CR together. There was no attempt by Qwest to shift the focus from the issue Integra brought to the CMP Oversight Committee. The proposed CR is a way to move forward. Qwest disagrees that there was no recommendation made by the CMP Oversight Committee. After the discussion of the issue on the June 3 call, each Oversight member was specifically asked whether they agreed with Qwest sending out a PID notice and issuing a CR to change the CMP document. No one disagreed. Integra requested the ability to review the notice in advance which Qwest provided.

In regard to your concern about referring recipients of the PID notice to the CNLA (this same concern was also expressed in an email today), the PID attachments will be specifically associated with the June 16, 2009 PID notice on the CNLA. The reference was specifically made to "...associated with this notification.." and was not intended to refer to the CMP Oversight notice distributed on May 7. When there are very large attachments associated with a notification, Qwest has previously used this approach of sending the notice and referring the mailout recipient to the CNLA to pick up the very large attachments. With two attachments associated with the PID notice each at approximately 1MB, Qwest will continue to make these documents available via the link to the CNLA.

3) The June 3 meeting minutes refer the reader to the specific CMP Oversight notice distributed in May which includes the the attachments that are available on the CNLA. Qwest did not intend on sending the PID notice until the final meeting minutes were posted to the Oversight URL which occurred on June 15.

4) The issuance of the Qwest CR is consistent with the way the CMP Oversight Committee expected this Oversight Issue to move forward. Qwest understands that Integra disagrees with Qwest's interpretation of CMP Section 2.6 and even our proposed solution. Nonetheless, Qwest's CR is simply a very straightforward attempt to solve the problem by removing references to the PID Administration Group that no longer exists while retaining the distribution of a notice by Qwest if a PID request is made.

Thank you,
Susan Lorence
Qwest CMP Manager

From: Johnson, Bonnie J. [mailto:bjjohnson@integratelecom.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2009 12:12 PM

To: Cmp, Escalation; 'allendm@att.com'; 'ebalvin@Covad.COM'; 'Brenda_Bloemke@cable.comcast.com'; 'Cox, Rod'; Coyne, Mark; 'Carolee Hall'; 'shelley.e.jones@state.or.us'; 'Quintana,Becky'; 'Redman-Carter, Julia'

Cc: 'cmpesc@qwest.com'; Williams, Mike; Isaacs, Kimberly D.; 'charity_pelack@cable.comcast.com'; Urevig, Rita; Johnson, Bonnie J.; Denney, Douglas K.

Subject: RE: Change Management Notice: GN: CMP - Oversight Review Submission

Qwest,

Enclosed are Integra's redlines of the draft notice and Qwest's Change Request (CR). Regarding the CR, Integra has not redlined Qwest's substantive request, though Integra disagrees with it, as Integra will comment at the appropriate time. The redline addresses the oversight committee language.

In the draft notice of Integra's PID request, Qwest erroneously indicates that the notice is associated with Qwest's CR. Although Qwest attempted in the Oversight Committee call to shift the focus from the issue Integra properly brought to the Oversight Committee to Qwest's new request, they are separate issues. (See Integra's enclosed Oversight review submission.) When Qwest announced on the call its intention to submit a CR, Integra recognized Qwest's right to submit a CR but also indicated Integra's disagreement with Qwest's position. There was no vote or recommendation by the full Oversight Committee in favor of Qwest's position. Neither of Qwest's documents (the notice or the CR) should indicate or imply such a recommendation when there was none. If this issue is to be addressed at all, it should be done neutrally, recognizing the disagreement of the parties, as proposed in Integra's redline. Qwest's draft notice indicates that Integra's PID request is available in Qwest's customer notification archive, but that archive contains Qwest's oversight committee meeting notice with attachments. Qwest gives insufficient information (e.g., the date and notice number) to find the notice. Making it difficult to locate and review the PID request is contrary to the purpose the notice is supposed to serve. Section 2.6 states Integra's documentation should be DISTRIBUTED (not referenced) and, in any event, attaching the information better serves the purposes of giving notice.

In both Qwest's draft notice and its draft CR, Qwest incorrectly states that "full discussion" is available at the Qwest escdisp URL. The only item available there is the meeting minutes (i.e., not Integra's oversight committee submission), and Qwest does not even give sufficient information (e.g., the date) to locate the minutes. (The minutes are not yet posted. Any reference to the minutes should not be distributed to CLECs until the final minutes, including CLEC comment, are available.) As indicated above, Qwest inaccurately describes its position, with which Integra disagreed, as a recommendation of the Oversight Committee. There is no need to debate Qwest's characterization of the results of that call, when the characterization can simply be deleted from the documents, and the minutes referenced.

Regarding Qwest's proposed redlines to the CMP Document, they offer nothing by way of compromise or recognition of Integra's position. Obviously, Integra will not vote for such one-sided Qwest changes and, as a unanimous vote is required per Section 17, the changes will not be made. Integra will comment on Qwest's CR at the appropriate time. In the meantime, Integra reminds Qwest that the CMP Document, including Section 2.6 as written today, is a part of several Integra and Eschelon (as well as other CLEC) interconnection agreements, and Integra expects Qwest to comply with its contractual obligations.

Bonnie

Bonnie J. Johnson | Director Carrier Relations
bjjohnson@integratelecom.com

From: Cmp, Escalation [mailto:cmpesc2@qwest.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 6:12 PM
To: 'allendm@att.com'; 'ebalvin@Covad.COM'; 'Brenda_Bloemke@cable.comcast.com'; 'Cox, Rod'; Coyne, Mark; 'Carolee Hall'; Johnson, Bonnie J.; 'shelley.e.jones@state.or.us'; 'Quintana,Becky'; 'Redman-Carter, Julia'
Cc: 'cmpesc@qwest.com'; Williams, Mike; Isaacs, Kimberly D.; 'charity_pelack@cable.comcast.com'; Urevig, Rita
Subject: RE: Change Management Notice: GN: CMP - Oversight Review Submission

As discussed in our June 3 CMP Oversight Committee meeting, attached is the draft notification to the CLEC community for your review. Also attached is the CMP CR along with the redline version of Section 2.6 that was submitted to the CMP mailbox today. If you have any concern with the wording of the notification, please let me know by end of day on Thursday, June 11.

Thank you,
Susan Lorence
Qwest CMP Manager
402 422-4999

From: Johnson, Bonnie J. [mailto:bjjohnson@integratelecom.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 09, 2009 2:10 PM
To: Lorence, Susan; Urevig, Rita; 'allendm@att.com'; 'Brenda_Bloemke@cable.comcast.com'; 'ebalvin@Covad.COM'; 'Cox, Rod'; Coyne, Mark; 'Carolee Hall'; 'Quintana,Becky'; 'shelley.e.jones@state.or.us'; 'Redman-Carter, Julia'; Isaacs, Kimberly D.; 'charity_pelack@cable.comcast.com'
Cc: 'cmpesc@qwest.com'; Johnson, Bonnie J.
Subject: RE: Change Management Notice: GN: CMP - Oversight Review Submission

Susan,

When will Qwest be sending the draft notice for the CMP Oversight Committee to review? Integra would like ample opportunity to review the notice and respond. I am off Thursday and Friday. Can Qwest send the draft before noon tomorrow?

Thanks,
Bonnie

Bonnie J. Johnson | Director Carrier Relations
bjjohnson@integratelecom.com

From: Lorence, Susan [mailto:Susan.Lorence@qwest.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2009 2:04 PM
To: Johnson, Bonnie J.; Urevig, Rita; 'allendm@att.com'; 'Brenda_Bloemke@cable.comcast.com'; 'ebalvin@Covad.COM'; 'Cox, Rod'; Coyne, Mark; 'Carolee Hall'; 'Quintana,Becky'; 'shelley.e.jones@state.or.us'; 'Redman-Carter, Julia'; Isaacs, Kimberly D.; 'charity_pelack@cable.comcast.com'
Cc: 'cmpesc@qwest.com'
Subject: FW: Change Management Notice: GN: CMP - Oversight Review Submission

From: mailouts2@qwest.com [mailto:mailouts2@qwest.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 07, 2009 4:33 PM
To: sxloren@qwest.com

Subject: Change Management Notice: GN: CMP - Oversight Review Submission

DRAFT Proposed Revisions to CMP Section 2.6

2.6 CMP Relationship with Management of Performance Indicator Definitions (PIDs)

Qwest Performance Indicator Definitions (PIDs) have been established through collaboration among Qwest, CLECs and state public utilities commissions in a forum known as the Regional Oversight Committee Technical Advisory Group (ROC TAG). This activity was performed in order to test Qwest's performance in connection with Qwest's application to obtain approval under Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The parties anticipate that the ROC TAG (or similar industry group separate from the CMP body) will continue in some form after approval of Qwest's Section 271 application. The parties expect that this industry group will be responsible for change management of the Qwest PIDs.

The parties acknowledge that the operation of PIDs may be impacted by changes to Qwest OSS Interfaces, products or processes that are within the scope of CMP. Conversely, Qwest OSS Interfaces, products or processes may be impacted by changes to, or the operation of, PIDs. As a result, efficient operation of this CMP requires communication and coordination, including the establishment of processes, between the Qwest and the CMP body.

The parties recognize that if an issue results from CMP that relates to the PIDs (e.g., Qwest denies a CR with reference to PIDs, or a PID change is needed in order to implement a CR, etc.), any party to this CMP may submit the issue to Qwest for discussion and resolution. At the time any party brings such an issue to Qwest, Qwest will distribute an e-mail notification to the CMP body. Qwest shall also distribute to the CMP body all correspondence among multiple participants relating to the issue at the time such correspondence is exchanged with the participants, if Qwest is not copied on such correspondence, the involved CLEC will forward such correspondence to Qwest for distribution to the CMP body).

It is possible that Qwest or CLECs, in the process of addressing PID changes, may identify issues that relate to CMP. In that case, the CMP body would expect such issues to be brought to Qwest and the CMP body for resolution or a recommendation. Such issues may be raised in the form of a CR, but may be raised in a different manner if appropriate.

Deleted: (the "PID Administration Group")

Deleted: that are within the scope of the PID Administration Group

Deleted: PID Administration Group

Deleted: discussion of

Deleted: administration

Deleted: take

Deleted: the PID Administration Group

Deleted: as appropriate under the procedures for that Group

Deleted: the PID Administration Group

Deleted: such party shall notify Qwest and

Deleted: with the PID Administration Group

Deleted: PID Administration Group

Deleted: Qwest or an interested CLEC will bring any resolution or recommendation from the PID Administration Group relating to such issues to the CMP body for consideration in resolving related CMP issues.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: the

Deleted: Administration Group will

Deleted: the PID Administration Group (or a party from that group) to bring

Deleted: Qwest or an interested CLEC will return to the PID Administration Group any resolution or recommendation from the CMP body on such issues. Qwest and CLECs participating in the PID Administration Group agree that they will propose, develop, and adopt processes for the PID Administration Group that will enable the coordination called for in this Section. One such process may include joint meetings, on an as needed basis, of the PID Administration Group and the CMP body to address issues that affect both groups.

Deleted: ¶

Open CR - Detail

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC050409-1CM	Increased clarity in Qwest-initiated proposed documentation changes, including avoiding overlapping notices and modifying notices if an overlapping change is unavoidable.	05/20/2009 Presented	Wholesale ProdProc		

Director

Originator Johnson, Bonnie

Owner Coyne, Mark

CRPM Stecklein, Lynn

Originating Company: Integra

Description of Change

Integra and its affiliates ("Integra") and McLeod dba PAETEC ("McLeod") request that, when Qwest initiates a proposed PCAT or Technical Publication change (both of which involve posting of redlined changes per CMP Document Section 2.5), Qwest allow the full CMP cycle to complete for that change before initiating additional proposed changes to the same PCAT or Technical Publication. In other words, the notices/timelines should not overlap. When Qwest initiates multiple, overlapping proposed changes to a single document (or any red lined document associated with a Qwest notice), it causes a situation in which CLECs are unable to consider the impact of that change based on all of changes Qwest is collectively proposing. This denies CLECs an opportunity to comment on changes in their entirety because, depending on the type of notice, CLECs may not be aware of a change that has already been made but is not reflected in a posted red lined document.

To illustrate, if a CLEC receives notices by category (e.g., product or process), Qwest could make a red lined change as a product notice and another overlapping change to the same PCAT as a process change. Considering that the same CLEC employee may not review both types of notices, an employee would not be aware that one red lined PCAT does not accurately reflect the PCAT as it will appear when the previous change goes in to effect. That could significantly impact how the CLEC may comment on, or react to, the change.

An example occurred with respect to the expedite PCAT. Qwest initiated a series of overlapping proposed PCAT changes that were so complicated that, on Nov. 18, 2005 in PROS.10.19.05.F.03380. ExpeditesEscalationsV30, Qwest had to provide the following timeline, in response to CLEC complaints of confusion: (See attached example)

Naturally, CLECs would like to avoid such confusing and overlapping Qwest changes and proceed in an orderly manner to review and respond to proposed changes. Qwest should not propose additional changes to the same PCAT in a manner that prevents CLECs from readily knowing the full impact and relationship of the changes.

Another example (also involving expedites): Qwest recently indicated it intended to make overlapping PCAT changes (relating to compliance with an Arizona Commission order in the Eschelon Arizona complaint case against Qwest, Docket No. T-03406A-06-0257) with respect to the expedite PCAT. Integra expressed concern in a Nov. 26, 2009 email to Qwest, in which Integra said: "Part of the problem that led to the AZ expedites case was due to Qwest using overlapping notices, causing confusion, and we had hoped that experience would have led to Qwest not issuing notices so close in time." Qwest has not provided any assurance that it will not make overlapping changes going forward.

Qwest should not send multiple, overlapping notices regarding changes to the same PCAT or Technical Publication. With appropriate planning on Qwest's part and attention to the CMP deadlines, any instance in which an overlapping change is needed would be rare. In such rare instances, if it is necessary to make additional changes to the same PCAT or Qwest Technical Publication before the previous changes have gone into effect, and a change will not be reflected in the red line, Qwest should communicate in the notice for the additional changes that there is a pending notice/change that is not reflected in the red line associated with the additional changes, and Qwest should provide the notice number and link to the proposed changes in the previous notification, as described in the enclosed proposed redline of Section 2.6 of the CMP Document.

Qwest will make mutually agreeable changes to the CMP Document to implement this CR (such as the proposed changes shown in the enclosed proposed redline of Section 2.6 of the CMP Document). The purpose of the changes will be to ensure that, absent an urgent or critical business need to do so, Qwest will not send notices that overlap, for a single PCAT or Technical Publication (or any document Qwest is red lining as a part of the associated notice of change). Qwest will allow the applicable CMP deadlines to complete before initiating additional proposed changes. In unusual circumstances, due to an urgent or critical business need, Qwest may issue overlapping notices but only if it follows the procedures outlined above (and in the attached proposed changes to the CMP Document) to ensure that CLECs are aware that there are other pending proposed changes to the same document.

Status History

Date	Action	Description
06/17/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the June ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment E in the Distribution Package
06/02/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
05/20/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the May Monthly CMP Meeting - See Attachment E in the Distribution Package
05/05/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR acknowledged
05/04/2009	CR Submitted	CR submitted

Qwest Response

Project Meetings

6/20/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that in the May meeting we had a discussion regarding Integra's changes to Section 2.5. Mark said that Integra presented their redline changes and Qwest also submitted its proposed changes to that language. Mark said that Integra has reviewed the change and has made additional changes. Mark said that we are in the process of reviewing and hope to bring this to a close in July.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that the document on the calendar is the redline that she and Julia used after Qwest redlined their changes. Bonnie said they accepted those changes and what you see is language that is currently not in the CMP document. She said that when we reach consensus there will be a lot more changes than this. She said it easier to accept changes rather than work from the original CMP document.

5/20/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that this CR was submitted as a joint request by Integra and PAETEC. Bonnie said that it is an ongoing challenge for the CLECs when there are multiple notices issued for one PCAT. She said that one of the problems is that until a proposed change is effective and if another change goes out for the same PCAT; the redline doesn't include the final result of the notice that is not yet effective. Bonnie said that this could impact the end result and how they view the subsequent changes of the other language being changed. They are proposing that Qwest avoid doing multiple overlapping changes unless it's required, i.e. a regulatory change or to change a phone number. If for some reason Qwest needs to issue an overlapping notice, Qwest needs to identify there is another pending change to that document that has not yet posted and is not reflected in this redline.

Julia Redman-Carter PAETEC said that the process of having changes that aren't yet effective is sometimes referred to as stacking. She said that if Qwest does stack they need to let the CLECs know what is being stacked. They need the full picture so that they can make an informed decision (5/28/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) AND NOT realize TILL LATER THAT there WERE other pieces they may not HAVE been aware of WHEN ORIGINALLY REVIEWED.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that Qwest can appreciate what the CLECs are saying in this CR. He said that it is a challenge for the documentation team that updates the PCATs when this occurs. Mark said that we do try to keep this to a minimum but based on business needs that come along it does happen. Mark questioned the sentence in the proposal where it states that this needs to happen on rare occasions and asked how the CLECs define rare.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said some level 1 changes impact the way they do business and those occasions are rare and considered immediate, i.e. correcting a phone number or if you have a regulatory change. Bonnie said that it sounds like this may help Qwest as well.. It appears when Qwest reviews a tech pub or PCAT and makes a change other things are done that need clarity or clean up. She said that it appears that when Qwest identifies changes are needed, they issue level 1, 2, 3 etc. Bonnie said that something to consider is that unless those level 1's or 2's are critical business needs or something that impacts the way they do business with Qwest, is to issue those changes in one change rather than issuing separate levels for 1 PCAT. She said that their recommendation is, rather than doing all changes in separate notices, do them at the highest level of change.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that he realizes these types of changes do present difficulty for the documentation team to track and is a challenge to both Qwest and the CLECs. Mark said we took a look to determine how often this has occurred and found only found 17 occurrences in the past 2 years. Mark said that this is in relation to approximately 977 notices and is less than 1%. He said that these situations will continue to occur on a rare basis as it has in the past. He said that we are in full agreement with the 2nd part of the CM request which is how we relate those changes on the notice to make sure the CLEC are aware of those changes. Mark said that he liked the idea of cross referencing or pointing the CLEC to the notice so the CLECs can determine the impact. He said there is a concern with the statement in the proposal that Qwest will not initiate a proposed change. Mark said we can't say that we will never initiate a change and that the proposal does include except in certain conditions. He said that we have a counter proposal with language in the 1st piece to accommodate our business needs, but at the same recognizing that this is a rare occasion. Mark said that if this happens we will address it with information on the notice.

Bonnie Johnson-Integra said that PAETEC and Integra will look at the counter proposal and is good to hear we are in agreement that we need to care for the issue. Bonnie said that they can't agree with the change from "will" to "should" because it does not give them any certainty.

Mark Coyne-Qwest asked that the CLECs review the entire counter proposal and let us know what concerns and comments they have and we will go back and take a look at "will" vs. "should".

Bonnie Johnson-Integra asked Qwest to let them know what they are trying to achieve by changing the language to not having any certainty. She said that "should" won't work for the CLECs and "will" won't work for Qwest but until they know what the concern is, she doesn't know what to propose.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC asked if Qwest would consider the idea when there are previous changes not yet effective, to note in the document that there are changes under review that are not yet effective and in the document redline highlight those changes.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we don't have a problem pointing back to the Document Review site so that you can see the related notice.

Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said if there was another solution (5/28/09 Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) THAT MIGHT BE EASIER for Qwest other than providing the information in the notice, they will entertain other suggestions. THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE IS to be able to identify ALL the APPLICABLE changes in those situations SO WE CAN MAKE INFORMED DECISIONS.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that he didn't see a problem on the 2nd piece of providing the notice number and providing a link back to the document review site rather than including the information on the subsequent notice. Mark addressed the comment from Integra on the "will" vs. "should" and it was phrased it in the 1st sentence that Qwest will attempt to avoid issuing or initiating those types of changes.

Bonnie Johnson-Qwest said that if there is an overlap notice it needs to address how you are going to handle and the result if that happens.

She said that the 1st part talks about the effort or attempt and the 2nd part should have certainty if unavoidable.

FINAL VERSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES ASSOCIATED WITH PC050409-1CM

2.5 Method of Communication

The method of communication is e-mail with supporting information posted to the Web site when applicable (see Section 3.3 Qwest Wholesale CMP Web Site). Communications sent by e-mail resulting from CMP will include in the subject line "CMP". E-mail communications regarding document changes will include direct Web site links to the related documentation. All Notifications are sent as "mailouts" and are distributed to all those who subscribe to such notifications at <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/notices/cnla/maillist.html>.

Redlined PCATs and Technical Publications associated with product, process, and systems changes will be posted to the Qwest CMP Document Review Web site, <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/cmp/review.html>.

~~Qwest will make every effort to avoid initiating a proposed change to a PCAT or Technical Publication when there is a previous proposed change to the same document that is not yet effective. If Qwest does issue an overlapping change (e.g., due to a mandatory change with a deadline, time sensitive matter, or other critical or urgent business need) to the same document before the effective date of the previous proposed change (with the result being a redlined document that does not reflect the previous changes not yet effective), Qwest will identify in the notice of the subsequent change the existence of the pending proposed changes. The Qwest notice of additional changes will contain a section entitled "Pending Changes Not Effective." In that section, Qwest will include both (1) the notice number(s) for any proposed change to the same document (e.g., the same PCAT or Technical Publication) that is not yet effective; and (2) a link to the Document Review Web site. For the duration of the agreed upon comment period as specified in this CMP, CLECs may submit comments on the proposed documentation change. At the Qwest CMP Document Review Web site, CLECs may submit their comments on a specific document by selecting the "Submit Comments" link associated with the document. The "Submit Comments" link will take CLECs to an HTML comment template. If for any reason the "Submit" button on the site does not function properly, CLECs may submit comments to cmpcomm@qwest.com. After the conclusion of the applicable CLEC comment period, Qwest will aggregate all CLEC comments with Qwest responses and distribute to all CLECs via Notification e-mail within the applicable period. In some instances, a CLEC or Qwest may wish to include proprietary information in a CR. To do this the CLEC or Qwest must identify the proprietary information with bracketed text, in all capitals, preceded and followed by the words "PROPRIETARY BEGIN" and "PROPRIETARY END," respectively. Qwest will blackout properly formatted proprietary information when the CR is posted to the CR Database and distributed in the CMP Monthly Meeting distribution packet.~~

If a CLEC or Qwest wishes to ask a question, submit a comment, or provide information that is of a proprietary nature, the CLEC or Qwest must communicate directly with the CMP Manager via e-mail, cmpcr@qwest.com. Such e-mails must have a subject line beginning with PROPRIETARY.

This CMP contains references to required notifications. Such references typically identify specific information that must be included in such notifications. Such information is not an exclusive list. Qwest will use reasonable efforts to include such other information in its possession that may be useful in aiding CLECs to understand the scope and purpose of the notification.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Deleted: ¶
¶

CLEC-Qwest CMP Voting Ballot

Name of Call/Meeting:	July Product/Process CMP Meeting (PC050409-1CM)
Date of Vote:	July 15, 2009

Subject:	<p>PC050409-1CM CMP Document Update</p> <p>This CR is proposing updates to Section 2.5 of the CMP Document to add increased clarity in Qwest-initiated proposed documentation changes, including avoiding overlapping notices and modifying notices if an overlapping change is unavoidable</p> <p>A vote of 'Yes' will indicate a preference that Section 2.5 of the CMP Document be updated to include clarity in Qwest initiated proposed documentation changes, including avoiding overlapping notices and modifying notices if an overlapping change is unavoidable.</p> <p>A vote of 'No' will indicate a preference that Section 5 of the CMP Document not Be updated to include clarity in Qwest initiated proposed documentation changes, including avoiding overlapping notices and modifying notices if an overlapping change is unavoidable.</p>
-----------------	---

Voting Carrier	Voting Participant	Vote		
		YES	NO	Abstain

Result:	
----------------	--

Open CR - Detail

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC060209-1CM	Update Section 5.8 of the CMP Document to add a new CR status of "Crossover"	06/17/2009 Presented	Wholesale ProdProc		

Director

Originator Stecklein, Lynn

Owner Stecklein, Lynn

CRPM Stecklein, Lynn

Originating Company: Qwest Corporation

Description of Change

During the operation of this CMP, there may be situations when systems CRs have requirements for product/process discussions or solutions, or when product/process CRs require System solutions.

If a CR submitted to the product/process CMP is discovered to require a mechanized solution the following will occur:

Qwest will open a new systems CR, on behalf of the original CR originator, with a reference to the product/process CR number. Qwest will close the product/process CR with a reference to the new systems CR number

If a CR submitted to the Systems CMP is discovered to require a manual solution the following will occur:

Qwest will open a product/process CR, on behalf of the original CR originator, with a reference to the systems CR number. Qwest will close the systems CR with a reference to the new product/process CR number.

In these scenarios, the CR being closed will be updated with the "crossover" status.

Status History

Date	Action	Description
06/26/2009	Communicator Issued	CMPR.MEET.06.26.09.F.06585.CMP_Vote_Required
06/17/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the June ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment E in the Distribution Package
06/17/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
06/03/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR Acknowledged
06/02/2009	CR Submitted	CR Submitted

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

6/17/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting

Lynn Stecklein-Qwest said that during the operation of this CMP, there may be situations when systems CRs have requirements for product/process discussions or solutions, or when product/process CRs require System solutions.

If a CR submitted to the product/process CMP is discovered to require a mechanized solution the following will occur: Qwest will open a new systems CR, on behalf of the original CR originator, with a reference to the product/process CR number. Qwest will close the product/process CR with a reference to the new systems CR number. If a CR submitted to the Systems CMP is discovered to require a manual solution the following will occur: Qwest will open a product/process CR, on behalf of the original CR originator, with a reference to the systems CR number. Qwest will close the systems CR with a reference to the new product/process CR number. In these scenarios, the CR being closed will be updated with the "crossover" status. Lynn said that Qwest will conduct the vote in the July meeting and will send out a vote notification.

5.8 Change Request Status Codes

The following status codes will be applied to Change Requests of all types (i.e., Regulatory, Industry Guideline, Qwest Originated, CLEC Originated). The status of the CR will be included in the interactive reports. CR status codes will not necessarily be assigned in the order set forth below, and not every status code will apply to every CR.

- Submitted - A CR is updated to Submitted status when Qwest's CMP Manager has formally acknowledged the CR. The CR remains in Submitted status until Qwest has conducted a clarification meeting with the originator.
- Clarification – A CR is updated to Clarification status once the clarification meeting has been held with the originator.
- Evaluation – A CR is updated to Evaluation status if the CR requires further investigation by Qwest.
- Presented – A CR is updated to Presented status after the originator has presented it at the Monthly CMP Meeting.
- Pending Prioritization – The Pending Prioritization status is only applicable to CRs for which the impacted OSS Interface requires prioritization (e.g. IMA). A CR is updated to Pending Prioritization status after it has been presented and is waiting for Prioritization.
- Prioritized - The Prioritized status is only applicable to CRs for which the impacted interface is an OSS Interface that requires prioritization (e.g., IMA). A CR is updated to Prioritized status once it has been presented for prioritization and the Prioritization Process (Section 10.2) has been completed.
- Packaged -- A CR is updated to Packaged status from Prioritized status if it is included in the packaging option chosen for the release. Design work is continued on change requests that have been packaged. CRs not updated to Packaged status (from Prioritized status) will revert to Pending Prioritization status.
- Development – A product/process CR is updated to a Development status when Qwest's response requires development of a new or revised process. A systems CR is updated to Development status when development begins for the next OSS Interface Release.
- CLEC Test – A CR is updated to the CLEC Test status upon the effective date of the change. CLECs have the ability to evaluate the effectiveness of Qwest's change and its implementation, provide feedback, and indicate whether further action is required. Through interaction between Qwest and the interested CLECs, a product/process Change as initially implemented may undergo modification. Depending on the magnitude of such modifications, it may be appropriate to return the CR to Development status. Problems found with newly deployed Systems changes will be handled in accordance with Production Support process as described in Section 12.0. Certain processes in Section 12.0 are also applicable to product/process changes. If no further action is required for a consecutive 60 day period, the status is updated to Completed, unless the parties agree otherwise.
- Completed – A CR is updated to Completed status when the CLECs and Qwest agree that no further action is required to fulfill the requirements of the CR.
- Denied – A CR is updated to Denied status when Qwest denies the CR.
- Deferred - A CR is updated to Deferred status if the originator does not intend to escalate or dispute the CR at the present time, but wants the ability to activate or close the CR at a later date.
- Pending Withdrawal – A CR is updated to a status of Pending Withdrawal when the originator requests that a CR be withdrawn from the CMP process. Change

Requests with a status of Pending Withdrawal are reviewed at the appropriate Monthly CMP Meeting to determine if another party wishes to sponsor the CR.

- Withdrawn - The CR receives a Withdrawn status when the CR originator requests that the CR be withdrawn from the CMP and the CR is not sponsored by another party.
- Crossover – A CR is updated to a status of Crossover when no further action is required on the original CR that was crossed over (See Section 5.7)

Formatted: Bullet Indent 1

CLEC-Qwest CMP Voting Ballot

Name of Call/Meeting:	July Product/Process CMP Meeting (PC060209-1CM)
Date of Vote:	July 15, 2009

Subject:	<p>PC060209-1CM CMP Document Update</p> <p>This CR is proposing updates to Section 5.8 of the CMP Document to add a new CR status of “Crossover”.</p> <p>A vote of ‘Yes’ will indicate a preference that Section 5.8 of the CMP Document will include a CR status of “Crossover”.</p> <p>A vote of ‘No’ will indicate a preference that Section 5.8 of the CMP Document will not include a CR status of “Crossover”.</p>
-----------------	---

Voting Carrier	Voting Participant	Vote		
		YES	NO	Abstain

Result:	
----------------	--

Attachment F– Walk On Items