



November 18, 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, November 18, 2009

October 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
10:45 – 10:50	<p>Qwest OSS Release Calendar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ See Attachment M 	Mark Coyne

10:50– 11:00

Walk On Items

Mark Coyne

❖ See Attachment N

Announcements

- December CMP Meeting – December 16, 2009 Time: 9:00 a.m. MT
- CR Submission Deadline: December 2, 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, October 21, 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 October Product/Process Meeting.

Review Active CLEC Originated Change Requests (Attachment C)

PC072009-1 Deconsolidating Process for Resale, UNE-P CSRs

Mark Coyne-Qwest said this change was effective on 10/1/09 and asked if there were any objections to closure.

Joyce Bilow-PAETEC asked if this could be kept open until they can use the process.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we will leave this open and revisit in the November CMP Meeting.

Review Active Qwest Initiated Change Requests (Attachment D)

PC052609-1 Grandfather Radio Carrier Listings

Mark Coyne-Qwest said this CR was effective on 9/10/09 and asked if there was any objection to closure.

There were no objections.

PC072009-2 Eliminate Qwest Connections Guide Program

Mark Coyne-Qwest said this CR was effective on 10/5/09 and asked if there was any objection to closure.

There were no objections.

PC072909-1 Eliminate USOCs in Montana

Mark Coyne-Qwest said this CR was effective on 10/12/09 and asked if there was any objection to closure.

There were no objections.

PC121608-01 Improvements to CNLA and Mailout Sub categories

Mark Coyne-Qwest said we are still moving the last of the process notices and will revisit in the November CMP Meeting.

PC060509-1 LIS PCAT Changes

Mark Coyne-Qwest said the final notice and response to comments was sent on 10/15/09 to become effective on 10/30/09.

PC081709-1 Eliminate One Number Service

Mark Coyne-Qwest said the level 2 notice announced on 10/9/09 with an effective date of 10/31/09.

PC082709-1 Grandfather or Eliminate USOCs in Oregon

Mark Coyne-Qwest said the level 4 notice announced on 9/25/09 with an effective date of 11/9/09 and will revisit in the November CMP Meeting.

Discussion of CMP Operations and Proposed Modifications to CMP Framework

PC100909-1CM Modify CMP Document section 12.8 to combine current Tier 1 and 2

Janean Van Dusen-Qwest said due to reduced call volumes into the CSIE for Tier 2 escalations and a desire to increase the responsibility of Call Center personnel as described in the CMP document, Qwest is proposing changes to section 12.8. The redlined document is attached. Janean said we are increasing the Tier 1 responsibilities to contact coaches and team leads that would happen at Tier 2 anyway.

Brenda Bloemke-Comcast asked what Tiers responsibility was being increased.

Janean Van Dusen-Qwest said Tier 1 and 2 are the same group and that we would like to increase the responsibility by combining Tiers which will make it quicker and easier rather than sending it to another person in the same center.

Kim Isaacs-Integra said Tier 1 would have increased responsibility.

Mark Coyne-Qwest agreed and said no responsibility is being taken away and that we are just combining the Tiers. Mark asked everyone to take a look at the changes and send any concerns to the cmpcr@qwest.com mailbox. Mark said that we would like to conduct a vote on this change in the November CMP Meeting.

Kim Isaacs-Integra asked if they should also send any redline changes to cmpcr@qwest.com.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said yes.

General CMP Comments:

None.

Walk On Items

There were no Walk On Items.

The October Product Process CMP Meeting was adjourned.

Maintain Meeting Details

Meeting Name:	October Prod/Proc CMP Meeting	Type	Monthly PNP
Meeting Date	10/21/2009	Area	Wholesale ProdProc

Attendee	Company	Attendance Type
Balvin, Liz	Covad	In Person
Beck, Dawn	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Bilow, Joyce	McLeodUSA	On Phone
Bloemke, Brenda	Comcast	On Phone
Boudhaouia, Jamal	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Bousfield, Carrie	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Chapman, Mindy	Neustar Inc	On Phone
Cole, Peter	AT&T	On Phone
Coyne, Mark	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Diebold, Jackie	TDS Metrocom/USLink	On Phone
Fauscett, Kasha	Comcast	On Phone
Hines, LeiLani	Verizon Business	On Phone
Houston, Neil	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Isaacs, Kim	Integra	In Person
James, Nicole	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Lorence, Susan	Qwest Corporation	In Person
Martinez, Denise	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Miles, Linda	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Preble, Lisa	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Redman-Carter, Julia	McLeodUSA	On Phone
Sonnier, Jeff	Sprint	On Phone
Stecklein, Lynn	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Van Dusen, Janean	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Whaples, Kim	Qwest Corporation	On Phone
Williams, Susan	Qwest Corporation	On Phone

Attachment B – Global Action Items

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

Attachment C – CLEC CRs

**Summary Change Management Process - Product
CLEC Initiated CRs**

Report Line Number	CR #	Title	Company	Current Status	Owner	Director	CRPM
1	PC072009-1	Deconsolidating Process for Resale, UNE-P CSRs	McLeodUSA	CLEC Test	Wells, Susie		Stecklein, Lynn

Open Product/Process CLEC CRs - Detail

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC072009-1	Deconsolidating Process for Resale, UNE-P CSRs	10/01/2009 CLEC Test	Wholesale ProdProc	Ordering	Resale, UNE-P

Director

Originator Bilow, Joyce

Owner Wells, Susie

CRPM Stecklein, Lynn

Originating Company: McLeodUSA

Description of Change

McLeod d/b/a Pataec Business Services is requesting a Deconsolidating Matrix Process for submit LSRs. The qwest documentation (PCAT) matrix is based on consolidating CSRs versus deconsolidating CSRs. Qwest (PCAT) documentation states: The process to deconsolidate a single account into two accounts (the end result being the current account plus one new one) using one LSR is only available if the end result involves like products and services and the end-user address is not changing. If deconsolidation of an account involves splitting an existing account into more than two accounts, there must be a separate LSR issued for each additional new account established. The LSRs should be related via a Related Purchase Order Number (RPON) and the Manual Indicator field must be populated with "Y". The One paragraph is not clear on the activity and the process for deconsolidating an already migrated account. Qwest CSIE center has requested McLeod to follow the consolidated Matrix. ACT =C, LNA = C, Recap features = N and Directory Listing of 'O' and 'I'. The PCAT Process documentation needs to be updated to include a Deconsolidating Matrix to assist in the LSR ordering process.

Status History

Date	Action	Description
11/02/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the October ProdProc CMP Meeting - See attachment C in the Distribution Package
10/01/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to CLEC Test
09/16/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the September ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment C in the Distribution Package
09/10/2009	Communicator Issued	PROS.ORDER.09.10.09.F.06904.OrderingOverviewV160
09/10/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Development
08/19/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
08/19/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the August Prod/Proc CMP Meeting - See Attachment C in the Distribution Package
07/28/2009	Clarification Meeting Held	Clarification meeting held
07/20/2009	CR Submitted	CR Submitted
07/20/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR Acknowledged

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

10/21/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said this change was effective on 10/1/09 and asked if there were any objections to closure. Joyce Bilow-PAETEC asked if this could be kept open until they can use the process. Mark Coyne-Qwest said that we will leave this open and revisit in the November CMP Meeting. 9/16/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said a clarification meeting was held on 7/28/09 and as a result Qwest will be making updates to the PCAT. He said the level 2 notice was sent out on 9/10/09 and is currently in review to become effective 10/1/09. 8/19/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Joyce Bilow-PAETEC said they were requesting a process for submitting orders when they try to deconsolidate CSRs. She said when the customer has migrated and they want to break up their CSR into separate CSRs, they are finding that when they submit the CSR, Qwest is requesting they submit as consolidated. She said they are having systems issues with fatals on the backend side and orders are in limbo. They are requesting that Qwest create a matrix for the deconsolidated so these orders can be processed in XML. Susan Lorence-Qwest said a clarification meeting was held on 7/28/09 and asked if there were any other questions. Susan said that we will be doing further investigation on this CR. PC072009-1 Deconsolidating Process for Resale, UNE-P CSRs Clarification Meeting – July 28, 2009 Attendees: Joyce Bilow-PAETEC, Kim Isaacs-Integra, Bonnie Johnson-Integra, Susie Wells-Qwest, Denise Martinez-Qwest, Sandie Tekavec-Qwest, Lynn Stecklein-Qwest Lynn Stecklein-Qwest said the purpose of this meeting is to clarify the CR submitted by PAETEC (Deconsolidating Process for Resale, UNE-P CSRs). She reviewed the following description: PAETEC is requesting a Deconsolidating Matrix Process for submit LSRs. The Qwest documentation (PCAT) matrix is based on consolidating CSRs versus deconsolidating CSRs. Qwest (PCAT) documentation states: The process to deconsolidate a single account into two accounts (the end result being the current account plus one new one) using one LSR is only available if the end result involves like products and services and the end-user address is not changing. If deconsolidation of an account involves splitting an existing account into more than two accounts, there must be a separate LSR issued for each additional new account established. The LSRs should be related via a Related Purchase Order Number (RPON) and the Manual Indicator field must be populated with "Y". The One paragraph is not clear on the activity and the process for deconsolidating an already migrated account. Qwest CSIE center has requested McLeod to follow the consolidated Matrix. ACT =C, LNA = C, Recap features = N and Directory Listing of 'O' and 'I'. The PCAT Process documentation needs to be updated to include a deconsolidating Matrix to assist in the LSR ordering process. Joyce Bilow-PAETEC said they have been able to get one order through with the activity of 'C' and

had to change the line level to a new listing of an In and Out. She said that the LNA of N, they have to include an appointment time. This is not a new line but is a change to the line. She said if they submit the order with the "C" activity, recapped the features (8/4/09 - Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) IMA WILL RETURN A FATAL RESPONSE "FEATURES ARE ALREADY ON THE LINE A LSR ACTIVITY OF AN "C" REQUIRES AN In and Out listing AND ONLY ONE LML PER LOCATION IS ALLOWED. They recapped the current listing on the CSR as the Out and put the new listing for this customer on the CSR. She said in the past, they have done this as New. Joyce said their concern is the LNA of N is not really an N but a change. She said the users have contacted the CSIE and everyone they talk to tells them to do something different. She said it has been very frustrating to only get 1 order through. She said they have submitted as an N and documenting everything in the LSR notes and now they are being told they have to use the activity of a C. JOYCE STATED SHE WOULD LIKE A matrix TO ASSIST IN THE LSR ORDERING PROCESS. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said in the ordering overview there is a section called deconsolidating and consolidating but it says the N state has to be the same product. Joyce Bilow-PAETEC said she referenced the same thing by product but everything is geared toward consolidating MATRIX vs. deconsolidating. Susie Wells-Qwest asked if at one time PAETEC was doing the activity type of N. Joyce Bilow-PAETEC said the (8/4/09 - Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) LSR overall activity, the line activity and the listing was an N. They would note this was a deconsolidation with no dispatch AND IN THE LAST 3 MONTHS the orders HAVE BEEN were getting rejected saying they had to use a C activity. Susie Wells-Qwest said with the ACT of C, we run into issues with IMA. Joyce Bilow-PAETEC said yes, if you use the activity of a C. She said the Line level can't be a C because it recaps the features for the line and it will say the features are at that location. She said that if you use a C you have to do the In & Out and if that line doesn't have a listing, they have been utilizing the listing at that location. Joyce said they were successful in processing 1 LSR. She said used the activity of C with the LNA of N for an active line. They recapped the feature because there was an additional line level USOC that was changed to a main line level USOC but they still put in the listing of an In and Out Denise Martinez-Qwest asked if PAETEC could provide the examples. Joyce Bilow-PAETEC said the LSR ID is 28626085. She said that the order that has been in limbo for 6 weeks is 28709993. Joyce said the users want to make sure the out listing doesn't get taken out. Denise Martinez-Qwest asked if they were issuing these orders on specific types of products vs. others. Joyce Bilow-PAETEC said mostly on the QPP Resale, UNE-P side. Denise Martinez-Qwest asked if anyone else on the call was having these issues or had any other comments. Kim Isaacs-Integra said it is always difficult to do these types of orders and the more documentation they have the better. Denise Martinez-Qwest said she agreed and wanted to make sure there were no other issues they need to look at when they take this offline. Joyce Bilow-PAETEC said they need to know exactly what is required on the LSR. She said that if they have to use an activity of N they are going to have to set an appointment time. They don't want to take the customer down and if you dispatch, that could happen. (8/4/09 - Comments to minutes received from PAETEC in CAPS) JOYCE ALSO REQUESTED EXACTLY WHAT NEEDS TO BE NOTED IN THE LSR NOTES FOR A DECONSOLIDATION OF A CSR. Lynn Stecklein-Qwest said that PAETEC will be presenting this CR in the August 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	PC060509-1	LIS PCAT Changes	Qwest Corporation	CLEC Test	Stulen, Sandy		Stecklein, Lynn
2	PC081709-1	Eliminate One Number Service	Qwest Corporation	CLEC Test	Schwartz, Cindy		Stecklein, Lynn
3	PC082709-1	Grandfather or Eliminate USOCs in Oregon	Qwest Corporation	CLEC Test	Schwartz, Cindy		Stecklein, Lynn
4	PC121608-01	Improvements to CNLA and Mailout Sub categories	Qwest Corporation	CLEC Test	Lorence, Susan		Stecklein, Lynn
5	PC110209-1	Discontinue GeoMax Interface USOCs in FCC RSS 1 and AZ, MN & NE State tariffs	Qwest Corporation	Submitted	Schwartz, Cindy		

Open Product/Process Qwest CRs - Detail

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC060509-1	LIS PCAT Changes	10/30/2009 CLEC Test	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
10/30/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to CLEC Test
10/21/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the November ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
09/16/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the September ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
09/10/2009	Communicator Issued	PROD.INTE.09.10.09.F.06913.Qwest_Delayed_Resp_LISV23
09/09/2009	General Meeting Held	Adhoc Meeting held
08/28/2009	Communicator Issued	CMPR.MEET.08.28.09.F.06857.CMP_AdHocMtg_LISV23
08/10/2009	Communicator Issued	PROD.INTE.08.11.09.F.06720.LIS_V23
08/03/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Development
07/15/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the July ProdProc CMP Meeting - See attachment D in the Distribution Package
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

9/16/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said an adhoc meeting was held on 9/9/09. The Qwest team is looking at the comments submitted and will issue a final with the response to comments. Mark said a delayed response was submitted on 9/10/09. 9/9/09 Adhoc Meeting PROD.INTE.08.11.09.F.06720.LIS_V23 Attendees: Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC, Mindy Chapman-Neustar, Kasha Fauscett-Comcast, Kim Isaacs-Integra, Bonnie Johnson-Integra, Doug Denney-Integra, Sandy Stulen-Qwest, Georganne Weidenbach-Qwest, Todd Rodgers-Qwest, Diana Rasmussen-Qwest, Susan Lorence-Qwest, Ellen Munz-Qwest, Lynn Stecklein-Qwest Susan Lorence-Qwest stated that the purpose of this meeting is to discuss a level 4 notice and the objections and comments submitted by Integra on 8/24/09 on PROD.INTE.08.11.09.F.06720.LIS_V23. The comments are posted on the Qwest Wholesale Website and the PCAT can be found on the Document Review Archive Site. Susan said that discussions started back in the spring and Qwest agreed to submit a CR and go through the level 4 process. Susan said there were a couple of other changes but are basically the same questions previously reviewed in the March and April time frame. 1. What is the impact of Qwest changing "Reciprocal Compensation" to "Intercarrier Compensation"? Why is Qwest making this change? How does this change apply, if at all, to CLECs when their ICAs with Qwest refer to Reciprocal Compensation? Qwest Response – Sandy Stulen Qwest has changed reciprocal compensation to intercarrier compensation due to the fact that not all compensation is reciprocal. Intercarrier compensation (9/16/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) IS MORE INCLUSIVE better explains how Qwest and the carrier deal with compensation between the two parties. Kim Isaacs-Integra said reciprocal compensation is a subcategory of intercarrier compensation. She asked why Qwest feels it necessary to change the terms. Sandy Stulen-Qwest said there is no impact. She said we changed it to intercarrier compensation because the compensation we exchange between the CLEC is compensation between that carrier and Qwest.. She said it doesn't change what is in your contract but is meant to be more intercarrier compensation. She said that with reciprocal compensation, there were some customers who had many ISPs behind them and we were paying a lot more than what we were getting in from a usage basis. She said this is to make it more clear between the two carriers and doesn't change rates. Georganne Weidenbach-Qwest said the traffic is more unbalanced. Kim Isaacs-Integra asked if there was any change to the CLECs ICA with references to reciprocal compensation. Sandy

Stulen-Qwest said the new negotiation template talks about intercarrier compensation in the heading where it used to say reciprocal compensation. Kim Isaacs-Integra asked about the other contracts that are referred to as reciprocal and said the negotiation template is just that, for negotiations. Sandy Stulen-Qwest said it is still reciprocal compensation with the same items underneath it as before. She said we still have DTT, entrance facility, LIS etc. and still fit under 7.3. Georgeanne Weidenbach-Qwest said historically reciprocal compensation means matching or duplicate and is exactly the same. She said most traffic is unbalanced. Kim Isaacs-Integra said she will take this back. 2. LIS Mid Span Meet OPI Subsection - Qwest is limiting and changing the product by changing the description. For example, Qwest removed the following sentence: "Determination of a midway point will be negotiated on the basis of each party sharing equally in the cost." Is Qwest's intent to shift the costs to the CLEC, so that Qwest no longer shares equally in the cost? If not, why is this change needed? If Qwest is claiming a change in law, please provide citations for Qwest's changes and resubmit the changes as regulatory changes based on the decisions that Qwest says allow Qwest to make such a change. To date, Qwest has cited no authority to limit the product in this manner. Although Qwest claims it is providing "additional clarity," the revised version is much less clear. Qwest's changes are in conflict with, for example, the Minnesota SGAT (as well as Eschelon's and Integra's ICAs in Minnesota). Consistent with Qwest's trend of making SGAT terms unavailable without prior Commission approval, Qwest with this change is removing SGAT language and replacing it with the PCAT description of the product to match Qwest's Negotiations Template verbatim. The Negotiations Template is not Commission approved and is no substitute for the SGAT. It reflects only Qwest's negotiations position and is not enforceable or proper basis for changes in CMP. Qwest Response - Sandy Stulen Qwest believes that the change in the language provides more clarity to the mid-span meet product - there is no change in the product offering. This is still a negotiated mid-span meet POI with the CLEC and Qwest each sharing in its portion of the build of the mid-span meet POI. This does not change ICA language in each individual CLEC's interconnection agreement regarding mid-span meet POI. This was originally a level 2 change and we agreed to make it a level 4. Kim Isaacs-Integra said Qwest is saying there is no change but Qwest has removed the sentence 'the determination of the midway point will be negotiated on the basis of each party sharing equally in cost'. Kim said this seems like a change and if it is negotiated and asked why the sentence can't remain. Georgeanne Weidenbach-Qwest said that we are complying with the FCC order and can't always be 50/50 because there may not be a manhole in the street that is 50/50. We are going to have to negotiate a little more and were trying to provide clarity on language because it is so old and nothing has changed. Kim Isaacs-Integra said Qwest is pulling out the negotiated part. Sandy Stulen-Qwest said the negotiation part is still there and the actual point of interface that the fiber facilities use will be subject to negotiation between the parties. Kim Isaacs-Integra said it doesn't say we will share equally in the cost. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said this has a significant impact on what they have today and was what she addressed in the original comment. She said negotiating something where the parties are going for 50/50, drives the parties to look for something that is 50/50 or something close to that. She said this is different language and they have serious concerns and are not amenable to remove the language that says the parties will pay 50/50. Sandy Stulen-Qwest said the parties will equally share in the cost and it doesn't say anything in this language about 50/50 and it all will be negotiated. Georgeanne Weidenbach-Qwest said that federal law says in a meet point arrangement each party pays its portion of the cost to build the facilities to the meet point. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said the negotiation was more or less to make it an equal. Georgeanne Weidenbach-Qwest said it is not technically in existence. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said equally in cost implies 50 % for both parties and doesn't drive anything towards an equal share. She said based on her experience with Qwest, she is not convinced this is what Qwest intends. If Qwest intends 50/50, she wants that language in there and by removing it takes a huge parameter away. Georgeanne Weidenbach-Qwest asked why we don't stick with what the federal law says. She said that their ICA language is not changing and this is a general product catalog. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that this is negotiated agreement language that has been approved. She said Qwest is not planning to use this as a general offering. She said Qwest relies on it and she ends up arguing it and spending time on what the language says. The language that Qwest is eliminating is in their ICA today and the language being proposed takes away a major negotiation tool that saves them time and energy. She said driving to the 50/50 helps the party gets them to where they need to be with less hassle and eliminating is backwards. She said this is not in their favor and doesn't think it appropriate. Susan Lorence-Qwest said with the level 2 that implied we weren't changing anything. And with the level 4 process, the SMEs have said there is no change in process. She said the level 4 allows Qwest to update documentation to meet the current FCC guidelines and requirements. We don't want to debate any legal issues on this CMP call. The intent of this call is to get additional comments and allow Qwest to give additional clarification instead of getting into a debate about what is in the contract because that is outside of the scope of CMP. Georgeanne Weidenbach-Qwest said this change is getting the language to be consistent with the FCC requirements. She said the argument is silly and when you look at the definition of negotiation it means compromise. In the network environment 50/50 is what we shoot for because no one wants to pay more than anyone else. She said there probably isn't a manhole that is truly 50/50 between the two of us. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said it may be silly, but as a negotiator trying to get to 50/50 gives a point everyone works toward. Georgeanne Weidenbach-Qwest said we have never had a problem negotiating a location since 1999 and didn't think PAETEC had mid spans. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said she thought they do have mid span meets, but will check. 3. Trunking Subsection - Integra objects to the statement "Unless specifically stated otherwise in the interconnection agreement you must have a separate trunk group for each type of traffic". Integra is requesting that Qwest retract this statement. Whether Qwest retracts it or not, it does not govern Qwest's relationship with Integra, and Qwest should put no process in place to enforce this concept as to Integra. Qwest Response- Sandy Stulen Qwest requires different trunk groups for Exchange Services (EAS/local) if there is a local tandem. IntraLATA LEC toll and JPSA go to the access tandem. This is the way Qwest requires traffic routing; however, there may be circumstances where Exchange Services (EAS/local), intraLATA LEC toll and JPSA maybe combined by using SPOP if your ICA allows it. Each CLEC's interconnection agreement dictates the terms of how their traffic can be routed. Kim Isaacs-Integra said the statement assumes that if the ICA is silent, then Qwest sets the terms. It needs to be reworded so that if the ICA is silent and additional terms are needed negotiation takes place with the CLEC and not unilaterally decided (9/16/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) BY QWEST. Sandy Stulen-Qwest said in the first paragraph it says that the terms and conditions for LIS can vary by individual ICA. This PCAT is for general information and is not changing anyone's contract. Kim Isaacs-Integra said they are hyper sensitive to what Qwest puts in PCATs and that Qwest has attempted to change their ICA using PCAT updates. She said PAETEC and Integra have examples where they have opened (9/16/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) DISPUTES because Qwest has changed the PCAT and assumed that changes the ICA terms. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said when they have older ICAs and things have been silent, they have operated in a certain direction. She said Qwest has now put it in a PCAT and they have disputes that have never been there before. She said Qwest says it's not in your ICA it is under the PCAT. Julia said they would be more willing to look at this with a caveat. She said that this is in direct conflict with what she deals with daily. Sandy Stulen-Qwest asked for examples because she was not familiar with this. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said she has been dealing with this for 8 months on VOIP and Collo. She said if Qwest is looking for specifics, she can provide the names of who she has been working with. She said this may be used by Qwest as a general reference but is not how it is used and includes litigation. She echoed Kim's concern if this is not intended to change terms, they want a statement and if their agreements are silent, this doesn't replace that and those points need to be negotiated. Susan Lorence-Qwest said we have noted their concern and will consider their comments. 4. Trunking Subsection - Qwest made changes stating that "...a letter from you is required indicating you will not be ordering one-way trunking in the future," but Qwest provides no basis in the law or contracts for this requirement. Integra is unable to find these provisions in its contracts. Qwest cannot impose a requirement like this if the ICAs so not require it. Integra is requesting that Qwest retract this statement. Whether Qwest retracts it or not, it does not govern Qwest's relationship with Integra, and Qwest should put no process in place to enforce this concept as to Integra. Qwest Response - Sandy Stulen The request for a letter is required when a CLEC wants the ability to use the full range of TCICs available. This letter is to ensure Qwest that you will not be ordering one-way trunking, therefore Qwest will not run into duplication or busy TCICs. The TCIC assignments will not be duplicated between the same point codes has been documented in Qwest's Common Channel Signaling Network Interface Specification technical publication since February 2006. Qwest's process to require the letter in order to follow the specified requirements documented in the technical publication has been in place for several years. Normally the CLEC was informed of this process when they requested the use of the full range of TCICs. Qwest decided that it made sense to document it in the LIS PCAT for easier reference for all CLECs. This was originally a level 2 change and we agreed to make it a level 4. Kim Isaacs-Integra said Qwest is adding terms

and it needs to go through the negotiation process. Sandy Stulen-Qwest said this is more for process than a term and the PCAT is for our processes. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said Qwest is trying to bind them to those processes and forcing them to take steps that is a term and is constricting what they can do via a process. She said it does change the terms of their agreement. Diana Rasmussen-Qwest said we want to avoid confusion and the potential rejection of ASRs. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that Qwest is telling them how to do their jobs and putting limitations on systems that have been set up. Susan Lorence-Qwest said we can make a process change with a PCAT update. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said a process change doesn't mean you can dictate new terms. Susan Lorence-Qwest said this is not intended to dictate new terms. Bonnie Johnson-Integra echoed Kim's and Julia's concern and that changing information in a PCAT are terms of an agreement that are not process (9/16/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) AND that THESE TERMS should be negotiated.

5. Trunk Group Subsection - Qwest changed the language from "you may" to "you will." Qwest has provided no basis or cited no law that allows Qwest to add this requirement. This also is in conflict with Eschelon's ICA in MN, OR, UT, and WA, and Integra's ICA in MN, which states: "7.2.2.1.3 When either Party utilizes the other Party's tandem Switch for the exchange of local traffic, where there is a DS1's worth of traffic (512 CCS) between the originating Party's End Office Switch delivered to the other Party's tandem Switch for delivery to one of the other Party's End Office Switches, the tandem provider is entitled to provide alternate Interconnection proposals for the other Party's consideration. Such proposals may include the request to establish a direct end office trunk group to the Party's End Office Switch." Qwest Response-Sandy Stulen Qwest made this change from "you may" to "you will" because Qwest believes this is the standard that Qwest is working towards and many of the CLECs have this language in their interconnection agreements already. Each CLEC's interconnection agreement dictates the terms of how the trunking requirement for 512 CCS at a tandem is handled. This was originally a level 2 change and we agreed to make it a level 4. We are trying to avoid tandem switch exhaust by offloading the traffic to the Qwest end offices. This is only a benefit to all CLECs and carriers in the long run. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said this is a significant and critical term and needs to stay as "you may" and objects to "will" Julia said she is in negotiations and their ICAs currently have "you may". Their negotiator said this is how it is in the template and this is 1 more document to show how you do business and not a reflection on how you want to do business. Qwest will drive us back to this even when they are negotiating with terms that say "you may". Georganne Weidenbach-Qwest said it would not be a positive thing if there was a situation where everyone's ICA said "you may" and there was a switch that was exhausted and no one would agree to augment end offices and everyone's traffic fails. She said this is a positive thing to avoid that kind of exhaust. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said it is a positive thing but will contradict and eliminate the points/language of the SPOP agreement. She said she wouldn't mind putting something in here that says "you may" if there is an exhaust situation that the parties will negotiate because it is a problem for them too. She said the way this is written they would have huge amounts of network that would be cost prohibitive because they operate with SPOP. She said it would be different if it said they can negotiate or notice so we don't exhaust. This is a very important term that is in their ICA. Bonnie Johnson-Integra agreed with PAETEC that this is an ICA term. Qwest continuous effort to change their product PCATs to match their negotiation template (9/16/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) WHICH IS QWEST'S VIEW OF THE WORLD is not appropriate. She hoped that it wasn't Qwest interpretation that because Qwest changed from a level 2 to level 4 that they would agree. Bonnie said that it seemed that Qwest was miffed that we are OBJECTING TO THESE CHANGES because Qwest changed it from level 2 to level 4. BONNIE SAID THAT QWEST MAKING CHANGES WITH A LEVEL 2 CHANGE AND THE CHANGE ITSELF ARE TWO DIFFERENT ISSUES. Sandy Stulen-Qwest said some CLECs have "you may", some have "you will" and some have even different language. She said we were trying to get to the standard of "you will". She said the terms and conditions of your ICA will dictate when trunking becomes an issue and when you work with your service manager you will use your contract Georganne Weidenbach-Qwest said that we understood their position and will take under consideration. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said part of the problem and when you run into an issue, is when you start putting contract terms in a PCAT vs. process. Georganne Weidenbach-Qwest said we want to drive to some consistency. Bonnie Johnson-Integra didn't disagree but the place to do that is in contract negotiations. Susan Lorence-Qwest said the next question about charges is outside of CMP. 6. Miscellaneous Charges section is not accurate. Some ICAs contain rates for the additional cooperative acceptance testing, automatic scheduled testing - the rates are not always dictated by the tariff. Qwest Response-Sandy Stulen Miscellaneous charges in the LIS PCAT are only addressing the miscellaneous charges that are used in regard to LIS. They are all billed out of the Qwest State Switched Access tariffs. The exhibit A's clarify that. The other miscellaneous charges where rates are listed in Exhibit A are associated with another section of the interconnection agreement, Unbundled Network Elements. Doug Denney-Integra said Qwest referred to additional charges other than the 3 specific miscellaneous charges that are listed in the contract. He said there have been disputes whether all of the references should reference that tariff. He said since they are in Exhibit A that dictates how they are going to apply. He said there is no reason to put a statement that references the tariff when that isn't always the case Sandy Stulen-Qwest said that is referenced in 5.4.3 in the Qwest state access tariff and could possibly change the wording. It is outside of the scope of the PCAT. She said that Qwest would go to the Exhibit A first anyway where it would be referenced to go to the Qwest state access tariff. Doug Denney-Integra said that would be accurate. 7. Application Subsection the Local Exchange Routing Guide (LERG) - Integra objects to the language Qwest added. The requirements regarding this subject are covered and governed in the ICAs. Integra is requesting that Qwest retract this statement. Whether Qwest retracts it or not, it does not govern Qwest's relationship with Integra, and Qwest should put no process in place to enforce this concept as to Integra. Qwest Response-Sandy Stulen The Local Exchange Routing Guide (LERG) is the industry guideline for traffic routing. Qwest's position is that it is entitled to route calls consistent with the LERG. So, Qwest believes it necessary to address it in the LIS PCAT. Each CLEC's interconnection agreement includes terms of how that CLEC and Qwest will utilize the LERG. This was originally a level 2 change and we agreed to make it a level 4. Bonnie Johnson-Integra said (9/17/09 Comments to minutes received from Integra in CAPS) AS LONG AS QWEST CONTINUES TO PUT ICA terms and conditions in a PCAT will be an issue. She said they identified this concern upfront. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said Qwest doesn't list all offices that subtend a tandem in the LERG and based on this language they have to do that. Todd Rodgers-Qwest asked if this was in reference to EOWLTF's Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said yes. Todd Rodgers-Qwest said we don't because we can't and they could not do this if they wanted to. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said Rox had questions concerning this language. She said for whatever reason she stopped getting the Qwest mailouts on 9/17 and was reassigned a week ago and hasn't been privy to any notices. Susan Lorence-Qwest said the problem was resolved because Julia's mailbox was maxed out. She did not want to leave the impression that Qwest randomly removed PAETEC from the mailout process. Susan said once we have so many e-mails and mailouts bounced back we have to assume the e-mail address is no longer valid. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said her mailbox was not full and said a number of other people were knocked off. She said the problem with the language is that the terms had changed and did limit what was there because they can't get to those subtending end offices for routing options. Those options are only available to Qwest Todd Rodgers-Qwest apologized that PAETEC would read into it that way. He reiterated the LERG doesn't allow this for ourselves or PAETEC and is the same standard for everyone. It's technically not feasible. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said she will get with Rox to determine how the language being proposed would create an opportunity for Qwest and not for them and will provide feedback. 8. Application Subsection LIS to AT Switch(es) Subsection. The change to add "SPOP" is vague and thus preclude an effective comment opportunity. Qwest Response-Sandy Stulen Qwest originally had that "you may connect to Qwest's access tandem for termination of Exchange Service (EAS/Local) and /or IntraLATA LEC Toll calls to all end offices subtending that access tandem in the LATA." Qwest is clarifying that this is used when a CLEC orders SPOP. This has always been the case and the CLECs are required to have SPOP language in their interconnection agreement to do this, but thought it was best to explain this better in the LIS PCAT. This was originally a level 2 change and we agreed to make it a level 4. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC asked if the following is a new sentence: In addition, intraLATA LEC Toll and JPSA calls to all EOs subtending an AT within a LATA may be delivered to that access tandem. Sandy Stulen-Qwest said it was and Qwest is clarifying that this is used when a CLEC orders SPOP Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that she would need to research this because it has a big impact to them. She will get specifics on what the issues are on the terms vs. the detail and the problem with changing the terms and if the process dictates the terms. Susan Lorence-Qwest said we have noted their concern and would be sending out a delayed response. She asked if PAETEC could provide feedback in 10 days. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC said that she should be able to provide feedback by September 18th. Susan Lorence-Qwest said Qwest will review the responses and proceed accordingly. 8/19/09 ProdProc CMP Meeting Susan Lorence-Qwest said the level 4 announced on 8/11/09 with an effective date of 9/25/09.

7/15/09 ProdProc CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said the level 2s have been implemented and the level 4 changes have been discussed in adhoc meetings. He said the level 4 notifications will go out with the redline changes. 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.

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC081709-1	Eliminate One Number Service	10/31/2009 CLEC Test	Wholesale ProdProc		Resale

Director
Originator
Owner
CRPM

Originating Company: Qwest Corporation

Description of Change

Qwest will be eliminating One Number Service, which is named Wireless Extension in all 14 state tariffs. The USOCs associated with this service are HME and HMP. The proposed implementation date is 10/31/09.

Status History

Date	Action	Description
10/31/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to CLEC Test
10/21/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the October ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
10/09/2009	Communicator Issued	PROD.FEAT.10.09.09.F.06949.Multpl_Elminat_One_Nbr_Svc
09/25/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Development
09/16/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the September ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
08/19/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
08/19/2009	Status Changed	Discussed in the August ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment F in the Distribution Package
08/18/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR acknowledged
08/17/2009	Action Item Created	CR submitted

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

9/16/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said we will proceed with a level 2 to announce on 10/10/09 with an effective date of 10/31/09 8/19/09 ProductProcess CMP Meeting Cindy Schwartze-Qwest said we will be eliminating One Number Service, which is named Wireless Extension in all 14 state tariffs. The USOCs associated with this service are HME and HMP. The proposed implementation date is 10/31/09. Cindy said there are no wholesale customers and would like to reduce this from a level 4 to a level 2 notification. Julia Redman-Carter-PAETEC asked if this was being grandfathered and if there were any wholesale customers. Cindy Schwartze-Qwest said this is an elimination and there are no wholesale customers. Susan Lorence-Qwest said we will move forward with a level 2.

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC082709-1	Grandfather or Eliminate USOCs in Oregon	11/09/2009 CLEC Test	Wholesale ProdProc		Resale

Director
Originator
Owner
CRPM

Originating Company: Qwest Corporation

Description of Change

Qwest will be grandfathering the following USOCs in Oregon – JUF (Joint User Service), and OBK6X, OAPXX, OVM1A, OVM1M, OVDXX (LATA Calling Plans). Qwest will be eliminating USOCs S1W1X (Split Intercept – 1 Month) and SIWCX (Split Intercept – Change in name or message).

Status History

Date	Action	Description
11/09/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to CLEC Test
10/21/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the October ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
09/25/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Development
09/25/2009	Communicator Issued	PROS.SIGX.09.25.09.F.06965.Grndfr_USOCs_SIGV97
09/25/2009	Communicator Issued	PROD.MISC.09.25.09.F.06966.Grndfthr_Elimint_USOCs_OR
09/16/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the September ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
09/16/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
08/27/2009	CR Submitted	CR submitted
08/27/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR acknowledged

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

10/21/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said the level 4 notice announced on 9/25/09 with an effective date of 11/9/09 and will revisit in the November CMP Meeting. 9/16/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Lynn Stecklein-Qwest said that Qwest will be grandfathering the following USOCs in Oregon – JUF (Joint User Service), and OBK6X, OAPXX, OVM1A, OVM1M, OVDXX (LATA Calling Plans). Qwest will be eliminating USOCs S1W1X (Split Intercept – 1 Month) and SIWCX (Split Intercept – Change in name or message). Kim Isaacs-Integra asked if there were any CLECs with these USOCs. Mark Coyne-Qwest said we will get with Cindy Schwartze (Qwest) and provide the response in the minutes. Kim Isaacs-Integra asked if Qwest was eliminating the Split Intercept 1-month and Split Intercept – Change in name or message or will there be different USOCs for that product. 9/17/09 Qwest Response Provided by Cindy Schwartze For the grandfathered USOC JUF, there are Wholesale customers. With all of the other USOCs, there are no Wholesale customers. Qwest will be eliminating the Split Intercept – 1 month and the Split Intercept – Change in name or message USOCs.

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
10/21/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the October ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
09/16/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the September ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
08/19/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the August ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
07/15/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed at the July ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment D in the Distribution Package
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

10/21/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said we are still moving the last of the process notices and will revisit in the November CMP Meeting. 9/16/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said we will continue to leave this CR open. He said we are

still cleaning up some of the history and hope to complete by mid October. 8/19/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Susan Lorence-Qwest said we will continue to leave this CR open. She said we had hoped to have the history review completed by 8/1/09 but we still have product/process notices we are looking into. 7/15/09 Product/Process CMP Meeting Mark Coyne-Qwest said this was effective 5/29/09 and asked if there was any objection to closure. Kim Isaacs-Integra asked if the historical notices had been moved to the correct category. Mark Coyne-Qwest said there were a few outstanding notices that we plan to have moved by 8/1/09. Kim Isaacs-Integra asked that we leave this CR open until the August meeting. Mark Coyne-Qwest – agreed to leave open and to re-address in August meeting. 6/17/09 Product/Process 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 database is 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 thought 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 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 sub categories 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 is 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 (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
PC110209-1	Discontinue GeoMax Interface USOCs in FCC RSS 1 and AZ, MN & NE State tariffs	11/02/2009 Submitted	Wholesale ProdProc		Resale

Director
Originator
Owner
CRPM

Originating Company: Qwest Corporation

Description of Change

Qwest plans to restructure GeoMax service. As part of the restructure, Qwest will no longer offer the following GeoMax interfaces: ESCON, ETR, FDDI, ISC, Fibre Channel – 133, 266, 531 Mbps, D1 Video and the Additional Shelf element. The USOCs associated with these interfaces are: CPSHP & FGOHP (ESCON - 200 Mbps – Protected) CPSHW & FGOHW (ESCON - 200 Mbps -Unprotected) CPSKW & FGOKW (ETR - 16 Mbps - Unprotected) CPSDP & FGODP (FDDI - 125 Mbps – Protected) CPSDW & FGODW (FDDI - 125 Mbps - Unprotected) CPSJP & FGOJP (ISC - 1.06 Gbps - Protected) CPSJW & FGOJW (ISC - 1.06 Gbps - Unprotected) CPSMP & FGOMP (Fibre Channel - 266 Mbps - Protected) CPSMW & FGOmw (Fibre Channel - 266 Mbps - Unprotected) CPSBP & FGOBP (Fibre Channel - 133 Mbps - Protected), CPSBW & FGOBW (Fibre Channel – 133 Mbps – Unprotected) CPSNP & FGONP (Fibre Channel – 531 Mbps – Protected) CPSNW & FGONW (Fibre Channel – 531 Mbps – Unprotected) CPSQP & FGOQP (D1 Video - 270 Mbps - Protected) DM2XS &DM2XW (Shelf) CPSQW & FGOQW (D1 Video - 270 Mbps - Unprotected) There are currently no wholesale customers with these USOCs. Expected Deliverables/Proposed Implementation Date (if applicable): The proposed implementation date is 12/16 /09

Status History

Date	Action	Description
11/02/2009	CR Submitted	CR Submitted
11/02/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR acknowledged

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

None

Attachment E – Proposed Modifications to CMP Framework

PC100909-1CM Modify CMP Document section 12.8 to combine current Tier 1 and 2

Open CR - Detail

CR #	Title	Date Current Status	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
PC100909-1CM	Modify CMP document section 12.8 to combine current Tier 1 and 2	10/21/2009 Presented	Wholesale ProdProc		

Director**Originator** Van Dusen, Janean**Owner** Van Dusen, Janean**CRPM** Stecklein, Lynn**Originating Company:** Qwest Corporation**Description of Change**

Due to reduced call volumes into the CSIE for Tier 2 escalations and a desire to increase the responsibility of Call Center personnel as described in the CMP document, Qwest is proposing changes to section 12.8. See attached redlined document.

Status History

Date	Action	Description
10/21/2009	Discussed at Monthly CMP Meeting	Discussed in the October ProdProc CMP Meeting - See Attachment E in the Distribution Package
10/21/2009	Status Changed	Status changed to Presented
10/09/2009	CR Submitted	CR submitted
10/09/2009	CR Acknowledged	CR acknowledged

Qwest Response

None

Project Meetings

10/21/09 ProdProc CMP Meeting

Janean Van Dusen-Qwest said due to reduced call volumes into the CSIE for Tier 2 escalations and a desire to increase the responsibility of Call Center personnel as described in the CMP document, Qwest is proposing changes to section 12.8. The redlined document is attached. Janean said we are increasing the Tier 1 responsibilities to contact coaches and team leads that would happen at Tier 2 anyway.

Brenda Bloemke-Comcast asked what Tiers responsibility was being increased.

Janean Van Dusen-Qwest said Tier 1 and 2 are the same group and that we would like to increase the responsibility by combining Tiers which will make it quicker and easier rather than sending it to another person in the same center.

Kim Isaacs-Integra said Tier 1 would have increased responsibility.

Mark Coyne-Qwest agreed and said no responsibility is being taken away and that we are just combining the Tiers. Mark asked everyone to take a look at the changes and send any concerns to the cmpcr@qwest.com mailbox. Mark said that we would like to conduct a vote on this change in the November CMP Meeting.

Kim Isaacs-Integra asked if they should also send any redline changes to cmpcr@qwest.com.

Mark Coyne-Qwest said yes.

12.8 Process Production Support

Process troubles encountered by CLECs will be reported, if at all, to the Customer Service Inquiry and Education Center (CSIE) (Tier 1). In some cases the Qwest Service Manager (Tier 2) may report the CLEC trouble to the CSIE. Tier 1 will open a call center database ticket for all reported troubles and enlist all appropriate assistance in resolving the ticket including center coaches, team leads and process specialists.

Deleted: 3

Deleted: .

12.8.1 Reporting Trouble to the ISC

The CSIE (Tier 1) serves as the first point of contact for reporting troubles that appear process related. Qwest has five Tiers in Wholesale Service Delivery (WSD) for process Production Support. References to escalation of process Production Support issues means escalation to one of these five Tiers. Contact information is available through the Service Manager (Tier 2). The Tiers in WSD are as follows:

Deleted: six

Deleted: six

Deleted: tiers

Deleted: 3

Deleted: <#>Tier 2 – CSIE Center Coaches and Team Leaders, Process Specialist¶

Deleted: 3

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 5

Deleted: 6

Deleted: six

Deleted: attempt

- Tier 1 – Customer Service Inquiry and Education (CSIE)
- Tier 2 – Service Manager
- Tier 3 – Senior Service Manager
- Tier 4 – Service Center Director
- Tier 5 – Service Center Senior Director

A CLEC may, at any point, escalate to any of the five Tiers.

If a CLEC is experiencing troubles with Qwest because of a process issue, the CLEC will report the trouble to Tier 1. Tier 1 will have the responsibility to resolve the trouble including determining whether the trouble is a process or systems issue. To facilitate this determination, upon request, the CLEC will provide, by facsimile or e-mail, documentation regarding details of the trouble, e.g., reject notices, LSRs, TNs or circuit numbers if available. Tier 1 will create a call center database ticket with a two (2) hour response commitment (“out in 2 hour” status), and provide the ticket number to the CLEC. If Tier 1 determines that the trouble is a systems issue, they will follow the process described in Section 12.8.4. Tier 1 will be responsible to work with all appropriate Qwest personnel to resolve the ticket to closure. The reporting CLEC(s) and Qwest will attempt to reach agreement on resolution of the trouble. This resolution includes identification of processes to handle affected orders reported by the CLEC and orders affected but not reported. If Qwest and the CLEC determine that the trouble can be resolved in a timely manner, Qwest will status the CLEC every 2 hours by telephone, unless otherwise agreed, until the trouble is resolved to the CLEC’s satisfaction. If, at any point, the parties conclude that they are unable to resolve the trouble in a timely manner, the CLEC and Qwest will proceed to develop a work around, as described below. At any point, the reporting CLEC may elect to escalate the issue to a higher Tier.

Deleted: With respect to whether the trouble is a systems or process issue, a CLEC may escalate to Tier 2 before the Tier 1 follows the process outlined in Section 12.8.4.

Deleted: ¶
If Tier 1 does not determine that the trouble is a systems issue or is not able to resolve the trouble, Tier 1 will offer the CLEC the option of either a warm transfer to Tier 2 (with the CLEC on the line), or have Qwest place the call center database ticket into the work queue. Tier 2 will then analyze the ticket and attempt to resolve the trouble or determine if the trouble is a systems or a process issue. If the trouble is a process issue, Tier 2 will notify the Tier 2 process specialist. The Tier 2 process specialist will notify all call handling centers (Tier 1 and Tier 2 at each center) of the reported trouble and current status. If Tier 2 determines that the trouble is a systems issue, they will follow the process described in Section 12.8.4. ¶

Except in a work around situation, see Section 12.8.3, once the trouble is resolved and all affected orders have been identified and processed, Qwest will seek CLEC agreement to close the ticket(s). If agreement is not reached, CLEC may escalate through the remaining Tiers.

After ticket closure, if the CLEC indicates that the issue is not resolved, the CLEC contacts Tier 2 and refers to the applicable ticket number. Tier 2 reviews the closed ticket and will work with Tier 1 to open a new ticket, and cross-references the closed ticket.

Deleted: ,

Deleted: s

Qwest will use its best efforts to retain the CLEC’s requested due dates.

12.8.2 Multiple Tickets

If one or more CLECs call in multiple tickets, but neither the CLECs nor Qwest recognize that the tickets stem from the same trouble, one or more tickets may be created.

Qwest will attempt to determine if multiple tickets are the result of the same process trouble. Also, after reporting a trouble to Tier 1, a CLEC may determine that the same problem exists for multiple orders and report the association to Tier 1. In either case, when the association is identified, Tier 1 will designate one ticket per CLEC as a primary ticket, cross-reference that CLEC's other tickets to its primary ticket and provide the primary ticket number to that CLEC. Tier 1 will advise other appropriate Tier 1 and applicable Service Managers (Tier 2) of the issue.

Once a primary ticket is designated for a CLEC, the CLEC need not open additional trouble tickets for the same type of trouble. Any additional trouble of the same type encountered by the CLEC may be reported directly to Tier 2 with reference to the primary ticket number.

Qwest will also analyze the issue to determine if other CLECs are impacted by the trouble. If other CLECs are impacted by the trouble, within 3 business hours after this determination, Tier 1 will advise Service Managers (Tier 2) of the issue and the ticket number for the initial trouble ticket (Reference Ticket). At the same time, Qwest will also communicate information about the trouble, including the Reference Ticket number, to the impacted CLECs through the Event Notification process, as described in Section 12.6. If other CLECs experience a trouble that appears related to the Reference Ticket, the CLECs will open a trouble ticket with Tier 1 and provide the Reference Ticket number to assist in resolving the trouble.

12.8.3 Work Arounds

The reporting CLEC(s) and Qwest will attempt to reach agreement on whether a workaround is required and, if so, the nature of the work around. For example, a work around will provide a means to process affected orders reported by the CLEC, orders affected but not reported, and any new orders that will be impacted by the trouble. If no agreement is reached, the CLEC may escalate through the remaining Tiers.

If a work around is developed, Tier 1 will advise the CLEC(s) and the Service Manager (Tier 2) of the work around and the Reference Ticket number. Tier 1 will communicate with the CLEC(s) during this affected order processing period in the manner and according to the notification timelines established in Section 12.8.1. After the work around has been implemented, Tier 1 will contact the CLECs who have open tickets to notify them that the work around has been implemented and seek concurrence with the CLECs that the call center database tickets can be closed. The closed Reference Ticket will describe the work around process. The work around will remain in place until the trouble is resolved and all affected orders have been identified and processed.

Once the work around has been implemented, the associated tickets are closed. After ticket closure, CLEC may continue to use the work around. If issues arise, CLEC should contact Tier 1, identifying the Reference Ticket number. If a different CLEC experiences a trouble that appears to require the same work around, that CLEC will open a call center database ticket with Tier 1 and provide the Reference Ticket number for the work around.

Deleted: 2
Deleted: process specialist
Deleted: the call handling centers (
Deleted: and Tier 2 at each center)
Deleted: and
Deleted: 3

Deleted: the T
Deleted: 2
Deleted: process specialist
Deleted: the call handling centers
(Tier 1 and Tier 2 at each center) and
the
Deleted: 3

Deleted: and the Tier 2 process
specialist will advise the call handling
centers (Tier 1 and Tier 2 at each
center)
Deleted: 3

Deleted: may
Deleted: 2
Deleted: directly

12.8.4 Transfer Issue from WSD to ITWSHD

CLECs may report issues to the CSIE (Tier 1) that are later determined to be systems issues. Once Tier 1 determines that the issue is the result of a system error, Tier 1 will contact the CLEC and ask if the CLEC would like Tier 1 to contact the ITWSHD to report the system trouble. If the CLEC so requests, Tier 1 will contact the ITWSHD, report the trouble and communicate the call center database ticket to the ITWSHD with the CLEC on the line. The ITWSHD will provide the CLEC and the WSD with the IT Trouble Ticket number. The IT Trouble Ticket will be processed in accordance with the Systems Production Support provisions of Section 12.0.

12.9 Communications

When IT Trouble Tickets are open regarding the same trouble, the IT and WSD organizations will communicate as follows. The WSD Tier 1 will be informed of the status of IT Trouble Tickets through ITWSHD system Event Notifications. Additionally, WSD Tier 1 has direct contact with the ITWSHD as a participant on the Resolution Team, as necessary. System trouble and information pertinent to ongoing resolution of the trouble will be made available via the external Event notification website found at URL: <http://www.qwest.com/wholesale/systems/eventnotifications/>.

Deleted: the

Deleted: or higher WSD Tier

Deleted: that

Deleted: that Tier

Deleted: the

Deleted: agent

Deleted: agent

Deleted: agent

Deleted: agent

Deleted: 2 P

Deleted: rocess Specialists

Deleted: 2

CLEC-Qwest CMP Voting Ballot

Name of Call/Meeting:	November Product/Process CMP Meeting (PC100909-1CM)
Date of Vote:	November 18, 2009

Subject:	<p>PC100909-1CM Modify CMP Document section 12.8 to combine current Tier 1 and 2</p> <p>Due to reduced call volumes into the CSIE for Tier 2 escalations and a desire to increase the responsibility of Call Center personnel as described in the CMP document, Qwest is proposing changes to section 12.8 to combine current Tier 1 and 2.</p> <p>A vote of 'Yes' will indicate a preference that section 12.8 of the CMP Document be modified to combine current Tier 1 and 2.</p> <p>A vote of 'No' will indicate a preference that section 12.8 of the CMP Document NOT be modified to combine current Tier 1 and 2.</p>
-----------------	--

Voting Carrier	Voting Participant	Vote		
		YES	NO	Abstain

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

Attachment F– Walk On Items