ATTACHMENT 12

AT&T / BST
Directory Listings Ordering Meeting Minutes
4/3/98

Meeting Participants:

Mary Ann Falduto	Kym Prescott	Louise Del Monaco
Vera Clements	George O'Neal	Frank Berry
Pam Nelson	Tosha Ervin	Kathy Taber
Mindy Diamond	Steven Howard	Kathy Massey
Sally Strain	Pat Rand	Cindy Clark
Debra Stockton	Nancy Shawcross	

Miscellaneous Account Number (MAN)

AT&T's position is that it should provide AT&T's account number in lieu of using a BST MAN.

Kathy Massey stated the reason a MAN is needed is that there is no 10 digit number in BSTs code table which would match AT&T's assigned number and the MAN would be used for future order activity.

Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T cannot send all zeroes in the LOCBAN field as proposed by BST.

Kathy Massey described the make-up of the MAN as follows:

Character Position(s)	Contents
1,2,3	Area Code (e.g. 404)
4	M (BST always uses M)
5,6	RAO association (numeric, >1 per RAO in some cases)
7,8,9,10	Account Identifier (randomly generated based on availability)
11,12,13	BST comptroller provided numerics

Options / Alternative for MAN were discussed as follows:

1) Use AT&T's account number in the LOCBAN field.
2) Use AT&T's account number and insert RAO
3) Use AT&T's account number and an AT&T specific alpha character to guarantee uniqueness on BST side.
4) BST provide AT&T a block of MANs. This option requires that AT&T maintain inventory of valid and available numbers. This is not a desirable option for AT&T.

Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T's preferred option, excluding option 1, is option 2. Mindy stated that AT&T would use only one letter per RAO and that once an account number is established, AT&T would use this account number on all subsequent order activity.

Mindy Diamond stated that using the AT&T account number helps to eliminate unnecessary future database cleanup work upon BSTs implementation of its long term solution.

Kathy Massey stated that characters 11-13 do not affect this issue.

ACTION ITEM: Kathy Massey will review the options above and will provide a status only on 4/14/98, which may not include a work plan.

LIST CODE FL FOR AT&T ASSIGNED NUMBER ORDERS

Kathy Massey stated that there are no billing implications with AT&T using the list code FL on an AT&T assigned number order.

Mindy Diamond asked for BSTs expectations regarding how to handle a "true" foreign listing with an AT&T assigned number. Kathy Massey stated that FL is required with FDN and the BST system is programmed to pick up the non-billable USOC.

Mindy Diamond stated that this issue impacts database cleanup upon BST implementation of the long term solution above in that AT&T would have to change any pseudo FL list types to the true list type code.

ACTION ITEM: Tosha will work with Gloria Burr and Diane Jones to determine if BST can convert the list code LN to FL based on the FDN. BST will also provide instructions on how to order other list types when using an AT&T assigned number (e.g., non-pub or non-list). Tosha will provide BSTs response to AT&T on 4/7/98.

Stephen Howard restated that AT&T's SRT is "dead in the water" without resolution of this and other issues.

DL BUSINESS RULES MANUAL REVIEW

The joint team reviewed the DL business rules manual and many changes to the documentation were agreed upon. Specific issues and resulting action items are listed below.

Section 2, Page 4, Item 3 - Mindy Diamond stated that R has never been a condition of JB REQTYPE and that BSTs own documentation shows that R is not required. ***ACTION ITEM***: Mindy will provide PON numbers and BST reject book reference. ***ACTION ITEM***: BST is to identify where uniquenesses occur based upon REQTYPE.

Section 2, Page 5, Item 9 - Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T coded to send USOCs based on BSTs own requirements and that this items reflects a change in requirement. ***ACTION ITEM***: Pat Rand will investigate if a BST internal solution is available to ensure AT&T is not double billed when USOCs are sent. Tosha Ervin will take issue and ensure AT&T receives a letter from BST stating the change in policy.

Section 3, Page 7, Item 1 - Pat Rand stated that BST missed this requirement, but has a CR in place to address this issue. Pat Rand also stated that Linda Tate has escalated to get these items worked. ***ACTION ITEM***: Tosha Ervin will provide a letter to AT&T indicating the date when BST fix will be in place.

Section 3, Page 9, Item 7 - AT&T coded to send @ in the listed address when appropriate. ***ACTION ITEM***: BST will ensure there is no problem with AT&T sending the @ when street number does not apply.

Section 3, Page 10, Item 9 - BST has only coded to put + before Jr., Sr., and III. For lineage such as 3rd, BST is putting coding in place to address. ***ACTION ITEM***: Tosha will include this item in letter to AT&T indicating when BST fix will be in place.

Section 3, Page 11, Item 10 - AT&T and BST agreed that AT&T can and will use its own ALI code for

consumer listings. ***ACTION ITEM***: BST is unsure about this agreement. Tosha Ervin will verify BST position.

Section 3, Page 12, Item 12 - ***ACTION ITEM***: Listed Tel No vs Acct Tel No. The agreement stated in the manual is correct, but requires BST clarification. AT&T is not sending /PN in feature detail. Pat Rand will validate that BST puts a /PN in S&E section of service order. If not, there will be an additional action item required.

ACTION ITEM: Linda Mull and Tosha Ervin will have a conference call on Monday to discuss agreements reached which are not reflected in the most recent DL business rules document. BST will incorporate these items and there will be a follow up joint team conference call to discuss.

Stephen Howard stated that AT&T's current position is that AT&T cannot move to I7 production until the DL business rules documentation is complete.

Section 3, Page 12, Item 14 - ***ACTION ITEM***: BST to provide AT&T ALL conditions on when to send activities A, D, and R relative to REQTYPES JB, EB, and CB. Pat Rand will develop matrix and provide to Mindy Diamond for review. Also, AT&T is not planning to send R in ACT for REQTYPE EB. BST will review and provide implications, if any.

Section 4A, Page 2 - ***ACTION ITEM***: BST to provide detail on this EDI content issue. What gets put into TN field? What TN does order get issued on? How are we going to handle this?

Linda Mull will obtain meeting room for 4/16/98 follow up meeting. Linda Mull will obtain input from Mindy and provide to BST prior to call. Linda Mull will obtain conference bridge for 4/9/98 at 10:00 to discuss manual ordering section of manual with Kathy Massey and Nancy Shawcross.

AT&T / BST
Directory Listings Ordering Meeting Minutes
4/3/98

AT&T / BST Directory Listings Ordering
Conference Call Minutes
05/11/98

Call Participants:	Stephen Travers	Linda Mull	Louise Del Monaco
	Mindy Diamond	Kathy Taber	Valerie Gray
	Vera Clements	Pam Nelson	

Stephen Travers stated that Pat Rand will be available at 2:30 tomorrow 5/12/98 to review the open issues with our team.

NEW ISSUE 043 - USOCs - Stephen Travers responded to the question "will AT&T be able to process directory listings orders without USOCs before 7/24/98 (BSTs release 3.0)". Stephen Travers stated that for those list type codes where AT&T does not send USOCs today, the order would have to be processed manually.

Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T was told not to send USOCs, therefore, AT&T just removed USOCs from its coding and now we are being told we should send USOCs. Stephen Travers stated the decision was put into AT&T's hands as to whether or not to send USOCs and that Mindy Diamond said "no" at the 4/16/98 meeting. Pam Nelson stated the USOC issue began before 4/16/98. Linda Mull stated that Nancy Shawcross' (BST) action item log provided at the 4/16/98 meeting was updated to reflect that AT&T will not be sending USOCs and that the issue was closed without development of an interim process.

Mindy Diamond clarified that BST originally requested USOCs and that AT&T objected to sending USOCs because this was not consistent with industry plans. Mindy Diamond stated that the USOC issue was taken to the Steering Committee where AT&T was told that there was only one condition where BST will convert to the appropriate USOC based upon the listing text. Mindy Diamond stated that the latest version of the BST business rules document (provided 4/3/98) contained an assumption that AT&T would NOT send USOCs. (NOTE: The assumption is documented in BSTs business rules manual as follows: AT&T will not send listing USOCs. If USOCs are sent, double billing may occur.) In summary, Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T fought to NOT send USOCs, and then implemented sending them based upon BSTs requirements which BST itself changed concurrent with delivery of its business rules manual. Mindy Diamond stated that BST then said AT&T could decide to either send or not send USOCs and AT&T believed by not sending USOCs it was in synch with how BST had coded. Stephen Travers stated that BST can support AT&T not sending USOCs as of 7/24/98. *Pam Nelson stated that BST needs to accept and work the orders without directory listing USOCs as AT&T will not be sending these orders manually. Stephen Travers stated that he will escalate this issue and it will likely be Wednesday (5/13/98) before BST can respond.* Stephen Travers also stated that he doubts he will come back with a different answer as BST has already been pressing hard on this issue.

ISSUE 012 - Stephen Travers stated that he hopes to have the matrix to Linda Mull this evening or by 5/12/98 a.m.

Stephen Travers stated that regarding BSTs 7/24/98 3.0 release, it will support processing of R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE. Mindy Diamond asked if this was valid now. *Stephen Travers stated that he will verify with Pat Rand if this is valid now.*

Stephen Travers stated that if AT&T sends an R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE, this will NOT remove the miscellaneous account number issue, but that a CLEC can submit their telephone number and the LSR will drop to the service rep for manual handling. Stephen Travers also stated that BST needs to address how to send the order without an approved/tested product and process. Stephen Travers stated there is no approved product today for this type of request. Stephen Travers stated there is an issue of conversion at a later date to build this appropriately. Vera Clements stated that with the R ACTivity, these orders go straight to BAPCO. Louise Del Monaco stated that Beverly Simmons told her that after testing the issue,

with an R ACTivity type, the order would pass all provisioning edits and go straight to BAPCO. Pam Nelson asked Stephen Travers what product this created. Mindy Diamond gave an example of how today if a customer within SBC territory wanted a listing in a BST directory, the customer would call BST to do this and therefore this should not be a new process. *Stephen Travers stated he will give the questions to Pat Rand tonight (1) Does BST support R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE today, and (2) What new product is created by an R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE for AT&T assigned number orders with listings only.*

ISSUE 028 - Stephen Travers stated that the exhibit will be updated to show the Atlanta, GA address as the appropriate listed address. Also, the telephone number at the top of exhibit should be 228-769-7916 in Pascagoula, MS. *Mindy Diamond asked if this means there is no /LA in the listed name field for Pascagoula and if so, this issue can be closed. Stephen Travers will forward question to Pat Rand this evening.*

ISSUE 007 - Stephen Travers stated that regarding Mindy Diamond's example of Empire State Building, if there is no AHN and AT&T uses an @, BST will accept the @ and not duplicate the @. Mindy Diamond stated the issue can be closed. ISSUE CLOSED.

ISSUE 035 -Stephen Travers stated that the requested examples are expected to be provided by 5/15/98. Stephen Travers stated that Tosha Ervin will work on the requested examples and will send them to Kathy Massey for approval.

The next call will be held on 5/12/98 at 2:30 Eastern. The conference bridge is 805-240-9483, host code 282044, participant code 320592.

ATTACHMENT 13

AT&T / BST Directory Listings Ordering
Meeting Minutes
4/16/98

Meeting Participants:

Linda Mull	Steven Travers	Nancy Shawcross
Mindy Diamond	Kathy Massey	Sally Strain
Cindy Clark	Pat Rand	Kathy Taber
Bern Seigler		

The Directory Listings business rules documentation review was completed by the team. Following is a summary of the discussion.

SECTION 2 - ASSUMPTIONS

Section 2, Assumption #9 - USOCs - AT&T will discontinue sending Directory Listing USOCs (date undefined at this time). When AT&T moves to Issue 7 code for ADL, AT&T will not be sending USOCs. For consumer, Issue 7, AT&T will continue sending USOCs until early May (date dependent upon resolution of open issues). Both teams agreed the USOC issue is closed and that no interim solution is required.

SECTION 3 - BASELINE AGREEMENTS

Section 3, Page 6, Agreement #1 - Asterisk - BST will have fix in place to handle AT&T business listings electronically without the use of an asterisk (for reversal of normal capitalization rules) as of 5/29/98. **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand will attempt to move up the BST 5/29/98 date for fix. Linda Mull will talk to Art Soderberg regarding AT&T's position on sending business orders requiring an asterisk manually until 5/29/98.

Section 3, Page 6, Agreement #2 - /LA - Pat Rand stated that if an order is submitted where there is a difference between the main listed address and an additional listing listed address, BST will not recognize the different address and the order would flow through without error. Pat Rand suggested that AT&T order these listing types manually until a BST fix is implemented (currently targeting 6/30/98). BST has an internal call scheduled for 4/17/98 to discuss the possible interim solutions. Mindy Diamond stated this issue impacts business production orders more than it does consumer orders. Mindy also stated that business will likely be in production by the first week of May, 1998. **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand and Sally Strain will look at alternate options and provide a firm date. Pat Rand will provide a status on 4/20/98. Linda Mull will work issue within AT&T to determine feasibility of manually ordering these listing types.

Section 3, Page 9, Agreement #9 - "+" lineal descent - BST has only coded for lineal descent for Jr., Sr., and III. This issue affects both business and consumer orders until BST fix in place. BST will provide date for fix by 4/20/98. BST fix will address 2nd, 3rd, 4th, II, and IV. Until fix is in place, IV will publish at end of name as Iv (uppercase I and lowercase v) and 2nd will reject. **ACTION ITEM**: By 4/20/98, BST to provide date when fix will be in place. By 4/20/98, Kathy Massey to verify if alpha numeric combinations will reject within BST or if they will publish incorrectly (e.g., 2nd).

PLA - Kathy Massey stated that if a number is used as the finding word in a listing, BST does have a default placement in operation. Kathy Massey also stated that PLA is NOT required when a number or numbers are placed as the finding word. Kathy Massey also stated that if a number is a part of the subsequent words within a listed name, the business rules DO require the use of PLA because there is no way to implement a default. **ACTION ITEM**: Kathy Massey will include the default rules for use of PLA with a number in the listed name in the business rules document.

Section 3, Page 10, Agreement #10 - ALI Codes - BST (Kathy Massey and Nancy Shawcross for Tosha Ervin) doesn't recall the agreement reached that AT&T would provide its own ALI code on consumer orders. Linda Mull shared a copy of a 1/98 DL meeting summary with BST. This summary clearly states that agreement was reached that AT&T would provide its own ALI codes on consumer orders. This issue does not affect business listings **ACTION ITEM**: BST will discuss the ALI code agreement with its Steering Committee Team members for further direction.

Electronic Ordering Business Rules - AT&T restated its request that BST include ALL DL business rules in the business rules manual. BSTs latest drafts (provided in the 4/98 meetings) have the manual ordering rules split out from the electronic ordering section. AT&T requested that BST provide these same type rules, where applicable, for electronic ordering. **ACTION ITEM**: Nancy Shawcross will take issue back internally to determine how BST will include these rules in its documentation. No date for closure provided.

Section 3, Page 11, Agreement #12 - Mindy Diamond stated there is no open issue with this agreement as worded in the business rules manual.

Section 3, Page 12, Agreement #15 - Mindy Diamond stated the previous agreement with BST was that BST would ignore /dgn in the listed name field, but BST stated it also ignores the designation itself. AT&T uses /dgn with designations, therefore listings already submitted for embedded base need to be verified. BST needs a comma for consumer and business when designation used as title of address. The example provided by Kathy Massey is: Smith, Robert, Esq/dgn atty. Kathy Massey stated the business rule to be that there is a maximum of two comma space sequences and that once two have been included, the information should be separated by a space only. Kathy Massey also stated that when multiple titles apply, the titles are separated by a space only and that the set of titles are preceded by a comma and a space. The example provided by Kathy Massey is: Smith, John, Esq Dr Rev. Kathy Massey summarized the business rule as follows: For residence and business personal name listings, there is a maximum of 2 commas allowed. For residence and business personal name listings, there is a maximum combination of 3 titles, degrees and/or designations allowed. A third example provided by Kathy Massey is as follows: Smith, John III, Esq Dr Rev. **ACTION ITEM**: Mindy Diamond will verify if AT&T has coded to include a comma when the designation is used as a title of address.

SECTION 4A - ELECTRONIC LISTINGS

Section 4A, Page 2 - Pat Rand stated that with an AC listing, the order has to be written on the number called. The customer of record must belong to AT&T. Pat also stated that the CLEC must be the owner of both numbers to be able to place an order. **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand will add a business rule indicating that for AC, the listing must be ordered by the same service provider as the associated listing service provider.

Mindy Diamond stated that she is "okay" with page 2, but that she has an issue regarding TN and PN. Mindy stated that all previous examples provided by BST had 2 /TNs and that we (AT&T and BST) agreed that if the listed TN is the same as the REFNUM TN, we don't have to pass the 2nd TN. Therefore, AT&T removed a /TN from one of the listings. Mindy Diamond stated that what was missing was the BST business rule that indicated it had to be written against the AC TN, but AT&T coded against the associated TN as previously required by BST. Therefore, the position of /TN is different from BSTs expectations. **ACTION ITEM**: Kathy Massey will verify if the order is impacted when all the numbers we are dealing with are on 1 account. Kathy Massey stated that if they are on different accounts, the order will go into clarification. Pat Rand will add an example to the business rules document depicting an AC on the same account. The example on page 2 shows establishing AC on separate accounts.

Section 4A, Page 7 - Kathy Massey stated that AMLs have the flexibility to be indented, but don't have to be. AMLs are only associated with RingMaster.

Section 4A, Page 9 - **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand will update all examples to show the address with OAD as it will be provided by AT&T.

Section 4A, Page 11 - **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand will include a closed parentheses in the EDI column for DST. Pat Rand will add a note that "See" is the only word allowed to follow DST.

Section 4A, Page 16 - **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand will add "Dr" as shown on the listing on page 15.

Section 4A, Pages 17, 19 and 21 - Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T was told that each line of the designer listing had to be ordered individually because, for example, Picard could be bolded and Skier could be in regular print (i.e., Picard as DB, Skier as DL) and that we could only use 4 characters for the list code. Mindy provided an example of how AT&T is currently coded to handle designer listings as follows:

REFNUM 1	REFNUM 2	REFNUM 3
TN 404-810-1234	404-810-1234	404-810-1234
LC DBP	DLS	DL
LN Diamond, Mindy	Diamond, Mindy (1) Skier	Diamond, Mindy (2) Scuba Diver
LA 123 Main	(OAD)	(OAD)

ACTION ITEM: Pat Rand will test to verify that what AT&T is sending today will work for designer listings (Can BST accept 3 REFNUMs on a new order OR 6 REFNUMs on a change order?).

Pat Rand provided an alternate option to AT&T's existing code, but Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T spent approximately 6 weeks coding this way in an attempt to meet BSTs original requirements. Mindy Diamond stated that if BST can accept AT&T's orders as coded in the above example, there is no need for BST to pursue the alternate option.

ACTION ITEM: Pat Rand will add a note to this example stating the example is to depict adding "skier" to the existing listing as this example does not reflect our agreement regarding adding both Picard and skier unless this example is provided to reflect the current agreement as shown in Mindy's example above.

Section 4A, Page 27 - **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand will reverse/swap the TNs in this example. Also, this is a foreign listing and requires address. Pat Rand will add the address. Also, Kathy Massey and Pat Rand will let AT&T know which address belongs in the LA field in this example.

Kathy Massey stated CR and AC listings do not allow an address. FAC listings require an address in GA or at a minimum, the city. Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T is putting the city and state in the listed address field for all listings. AT&T will send OAD and address, but if it is a FAC, BST needs to print the city and state, which can be picked up from the Listed Address field. This impacts all AT&T assigned number listings as they are considered foreign listings by BST. For AT&T assigned number orders, AT&T will send (OAD) on all AC and FAC listings and will insert the city and state on every FL listing. **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand will test to verify if BST can extract the city and state where required.

Section 4A, Pages 29 and 31 - **ACTION ITEM**: For all FAC, FCR, and FL listing types, Pat Rand will change the notation at the bottom of the page as follows: In Georgia directories, the address cannot be

completely omitted from Foreign Listings, "except for foreign cross reference listings".

Section 4A, Page 31 - **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand will update example to show (OAD) and full address (i.e., (OAD), address, city and state).

Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T always sends listed address. Mindy also stated that AT&T always adds the city and state for foreign listings (including AT&T assigned number orders). The OAD option is required on CR, FCR, AC, and FAC listings. Kathy Massey stated that at a minimum, in GA, FAC listings require the city. Kathy Massey also stated that every foreign listing except for the foreign cross reference listing, is allowed an address. For all foreign listings, address can be omitted completely in all states except GA where the city is required, at a minimum.

Stylist Listings - **ACTION ITEM**: Pat Rand will determine if AT&T can order stylist listings electronically and provide an example for business rules document of how to order stylist listings electronically. AT&T has coded such that for stylist listings, AT&T will float /PCN in the listed name field as follows: /PCN 335-BOAT.

YPH and SIC - Kathy Massey stated YPH and SIC are required entries when establishing a new business account, otherwise YPH and SIC are optional and that TOS drives the need for YPH and SIC.

OPEN ITEM FROM 4/13/98 CALL WITH BST - **ACTION ITEM** - BST will provide a list detailing which list codes should be sent with AT&T assigned number orders for all listing types.

SECTION 4B - MANUAL ORDERING PROCEDURES

Page 12 - Designations - Today, as previously instructed by BST, AT&T does not precede a designation with a FID type indicator (e.g., /dgn) on the manual directory listing forms. Kathy Massey stated that, at some undefined point in the future, BST will add a unique column or field for designations. However, in the meantime, BST suggests that AT&T incorporate the use of /dgn to ensure the listing is accurate. The example shown by BST is that a business named Harry's, if a grocery store, could appear in the directory as Harry's groc when in reality the real name is simply Harry's. Kathy Massey stated that BSTs reps would likely be able to identify designations (lowercase descriptions) without the /dgn, but there is a risk that a mistake could be made and not caught.

ACTION ITEM: Linda Mull will discuss AT&T using the /dgn on directory listing manual order forms with AT&T internally. This item is identified as a BST specific workaround. Another potential option for AT&T is to add another column on the IDF form to be used specifically for designations (Kathy Massey stated this was an acceptable option.)

Page 24 - Parentheses - BST provided new requirements regarding the use of parentheses. Parentheses may be used to indicate established captions and established indented listings. The portion of the order which are being affected by the order are shown without parentheses. Kathy Massey stated the listing shown in parentheses should be the listing just above where the new listing is to be placed. The established captions and indentions shown in parentheses do not appear in the directory. Kathy Massey stated that if AT&T relies solely upon the listing order column, the listing will not likely make it in the directory in the desired place. Also, AT&T is not using the PRE and FOL instruction codes.

ACTION ITEM: Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T's center needs to update its M&Ps to handle changes to established captions and indented listings with the use of parentheses. Linda Mull will discuss these changes with AT&T internally.

Pages 28 and 29 - Listing Instruction Codes - BST provided a new requirement that for non-listed orders where the list codes of LN, AL, AML, ASL, or CML apply and a listed name ordered as non-published, two list codes must be shown on the manual ordering form (e.g., LN/NL and LN/NP).

ACTION ITEM: Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T's center needs to update its M&Ps to enable ordering both listing instruction codes as stated above (e.g., LN/NL, LN/NP).

ACTION ITEM: ALI Codes - Linda Mull to investigate as to whether or not IDF requires the use of ALI codes. Kathy Massey stated that AT&T does NOT need ALI codes when manually ordering directory listings. The issues surrounds the concerns of not using ALI. These concerns were as follows: 1) how can we ensure BST identifies the appropriate listing, 2) who is responsible if the advertising is incorrect, AT&T, BST or BAPCO?, and 3) if used, where is the ALI code placed? Linda Mull will contact BST if AT&T will be using ALI on the manual form and where it will be populated.

Page 30 - Certain abbreviated words such as "Dr" and "Mr" are normally alphabetized as the spelled in full version. When used as the finding word, and the customer requests that the words be alphabetized in the abbreviated form, (PLA) is used.

ACTION ITEM: Linda Mull will check the BAPCO guide to determine if an all inclusive list exists depicting which words are alphabetized in the spelled in full version. If an exclusive list is not included in the BAPCO guide, Linda Mull will contact Rook Baretto for the list.

ACTION ITEM: Pages 50 and 58 - Dual Name Listings and Stylist Service Listings - Kathy Massey will remove the notes indicating that dual name and stylist service listings must be ordered manually.

ACTION ITEM: Linda Mull stated that AT&T is using and has numerous orders completed using the ACTivity codes of I and O. Linda Mull to determine if AT&T is sending the ACTivity codes of I and O (in and out) for listing changes, as opposed to A and D (add and delete) and will share the information with BST for determining next steps.

AT&T / BST Directory Listings Ordering
Conference Call Minutes
05/12/98

Call Participants:	Louise Del Monaco	Linda Mull	Pat Rand
	Mindy Diamond	Tosha Ervin	
	Vera Clements	Nancy Shawcross	

Our next call will be held on 5/15/98 at 2:30 Eastern. The conference bridge is 334-262-0740, host code 107707, participant code 234028.

ISSUES 006, 008, 015, and 043 - Linda Mull stated AT&T's position that BST did not implement these issues according to our previous agreement and BST will not be implementing its fix for these issues until 7/24/98. Therefore, BST must accept these orders electronically from AT&T, without any related rejection or clarification, and handle any resulting interim process at BST.

ISSUE 012 - Pat Rand stated that the R ACTivity with a JB REQTYPE is available today, but that BST doesn't have this in place to generate USOCs. Pat Rand also stated that BST has verified the EB and FB REQTYPES for resale. Pat Rand stated that BST generates USOCs with activity levels of V, W, C, and A and in these cases, AT&T can submit an order electronically and that BST will generate USOCs.

Tosha Ervin stated that JB orders using R ACTivity do NOT bypass edits at BST. Tosha Ervin stated these orders are subject to the same edits as any other orders.
Tosha Ervin clarified that R ACTivity with JB REQTYPE is not a product.

Tosha Ervin stated the matrix BST is preparing is a multi-departmental task. Tosha Ervin stated that BST's draft has gone to the 2nd department for review and concurrence. *Tosha stated that BST expects the 2nd departments' response by Friday, 5/15/98, and that if there are no concerns or issues, BST will provide the matrix by close of business 5/15/98. Tosha stated that if there are concerns, BST will give its projected date for completion on 5/15/98.*

ISSUE 001 - Tosha Ervin stated BST concern that it will need to build in test time for the MAN option AT&T chooses and requested AT&T's decision on which option it will choose as soon as possible. Linda Mull stated that AT&T is reviewing its options and the associated issues and will provide AT&T's direction as soon as it is finalized.

ISSUE 043 - Linda Mull read the minutes recorded at the 4/16/98 meeting with BST as follows: "AT&T will discontinue sending Directory Listing USOCs (date undefined at this time). When AT&T moves to Issue 7 code for ADL, AT&T will NOT be sending USOCs. For consumer, Issue 7, AT&T will continue sending USOCs until early May (date dependent upon resolution of open issues). Both teams agreed the USOC issue is closed and that no interim solution is required."

ISSUES 028 & 029 - Pat Rand stated that she updated the exhibit for the business rules manual and that we DO need /LA. Mindy Diamond questioned why the /LA was needed. Mindy asked the following questions of Pat: Why can't we do a comma and separation?, Why doesn't Pascagoula go in the listed address?, Why is BST asking for Atlanta to go in listed address when listed address is Pascagoula?, Why can't we put Pascagoula in listed address field with no reference to the Atlanta address?. Pat Rand stated that normally we don't have FACs going between different states in different directories. *Pat Rand stated she will check with Kathy Massey to be sure if the /LA is needed. Pat Rand stated she has already paged Kathy Massey and Tosha Ervin stated that she too would call Kathy Massey.*

ISSUE 009 - Linda Mull provided the AT&T ALI code detail requested by BST to Tosha Ervin. Pat Rand stated that BST needs to look at the impact. Tosha Ervin stated that BST currently uses alpha characters

for ALI. Linda Mull stated that AT&T also uses alpha characters for ALI. Pat Rand stated that if AT&T duplicates an ALI on a given order, the order will reject. Pat Rand stated she was surprised that we haven't had any rejects on ALI. Mindy Diamond stated that this is how AT&T and BST have operated since day 1. Pat Rand stated that with migrations (V), all ALIs coming in are new. Mindy Diamond stated that AT&T will know its own existing ALIs when doing subsequent change orders. Pat Rand stated that V consumer orders are being renumbered, therefore, there is no issue and subsequent to the initial V, AT&T will manage its own ALI. *Tosha Ervin stated that she has no date at this time for BSTs response, but will provide BSTs response date by 5/15/98.*

ISSUE 019 - Tosha Ervin stated that BST has escalated this issue to Jan Burris, but does not have a target date for delivery at this time. Tosha Ervin stated the issue is "when" BST will provide this information and not "if" BST will provide this information. Tosha stated that she is awaiting Jan's response.

ISSUE 020 - Mindy Diamond stated issue can be closed. ISSUE CLOSED.

ISSUE 035 - Tosha Ervin stated that BST is on target to provide examples by 5/15/98.

ISSUE 040 - Tosha Ervin stated that BST will accept I and O as ACT values on manual orders.

NEW ISSUE 044 - Tosha Ervin stated that BST will include its agreement to accept I and O ACT values for manual ordering in the business rules manual agreements section.

ATTACHMENT 14

1200 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Promenade One
Atlanta, GA 30309

April 8, 1996

Mr. Stephen E. Travers
Sales Director
AT&T Regional Account Team
BellSouth Interconnection Services
[By facsimile: 770-492-9412]

Dear Stephen:

As a follow-up to our messages and phone calls, this memo restates and prioritizes outstanding EDI-7 issues and work items required for AT&T to continue our interface testing program and Service Readiness Tests for AT&T Digital Link Services.

1. Partial Migrations.
   We are awaiting clarification of the rules for populating the LOC-BAN field, and BellSouth's ability to react to remarks including AT&T account numbers. AT&T is not receptive to solutions requiring multiple orders.

2. Subsequent Migrations.
   Related to Issue 1, we are looking for requirements and rules governing valid combinations for Order Activity and Line Level Activity.

3. Foreign Directory Listings.
   Need to reach closure on requirements and rules.

4. Miscellaneous Account Assignment.
   BellSouth has been requested to evaluate all options proposed in our meeting, in addition to the proposal to provide AT&T a block of valid account numbers requiring inventory maintenance activity.

5. Stability of BellSouth's System.
   BellSouth responded that steps were taken to improve its platform's performance. However, our Software Quality Assurance organization is still waiting for the results of root cause analyses explaining why multiple, conflicting responses to order transactions were received. Can data on systems performance stability on AT&T orders be supplied?

6. Directory Listing USOCs.
   AT&T is performing time and cost analyses to support its decision on continuing to send DL USOCs. We will tell BellSouth our decision on Monday, April 13th.

   Given BellSouth's latest position (per our telephone call at 2pm) that its programming resources require a decision today or we risk losing the ability to accommodate changes until August, AT&T will follow BellSouth's requirements, and send DL USOCs, with BellSouth making changes to prevent double billing and correct transaction processing. This is an interim solution. AT&T will complete its own business analyses, and reserves the right to decide not to send DL USOCs, or some other appropriate long-term solution.

BellSouth had committed that Delores Jones would respond to the AT&T Assigned Numbers issues with a test plan on April 7th. That response is overdue.

We hope that BellSouth will be able to present recommended solutions and production-volume-oriented clarifications to outstanding issues in our meeting scheduled April 14th. AT&T is anticipating discussing work plans for delivering the expected EDI-7 functionality.

AT&T will require an appropriate amount of time to test the stability of changes to the platform. BellSouth is requested to evaluate its ability to keep the EDI-6 environment available beyond its currently scheduled "sunset date" should our testing not be concluded, if functionality is delayed, or if systems performance has not improved.

I appreciate your taking point and helping to shepherd these issues to closure.

Sincerely,

Steven M. Howard
District Manager - Platform Implementation

Copies to: J. Burriss
R. Crafton
M. Diamond
P. Nelson

ATTACHMENT 15

PHONE LOG OF RAY CRAFTON (AT&T)

4/8
6:40 p.m.

Scott, this is Ray Crafton at AT&T. We haven't made much headway since I called you last Friday. So I need to ask you to redouble your efforts to break the log jam on AT&T Digital Link market entry. Because of the growing impact to our schedule, I plan to escalate these issues to Phil Osman and Elton King at close of business tomorrow. I understand you may be on vacation today or this week, but hopefully you'll get this in time to do something about it.

Rather than giving you highlights as before, let me give you all the critical issues beginning with the highest priority item. These were faxed to Steve Travers this afternoon.

As regards partial and subsequent migrations, we had been promised an answer by BellSouth on April 7th. This has to do first with which company's account number will be populated in the LOC BAN field and secondly with requirements and rules for combining order activities with line level activities. Resolving this pair of issues is our number one priority in breaking the ADL log jam. Yet your team has missed a deadline and seems to have no prospect for working these two issues any time soon. Without closure on these issues, we can't code, test, and get to market. As the delay in a BellSouth answer increases, the testing schedule problems become more complex for both of us because of other commitments for test resources. Because we can't seem to close the EDI7 project with you, other projects are now feeling the effect.

As regards Foreign Directory Listings, Scott, we still need closure on requirements and rules. We thought we had an agreement to send the Foreign Book Name. Now your team wants something different and we're not sure what.

As regards Miscellaneous Account Numbers we received a proposal for closure from you earlier this week. This proposal was selected by BellSouth from a list of 4 alternatives. Unfortunately, the proposed closure would force our work center to maintain an inventory of assignable account numbers and we don't think that's workable or cost-effective. Going with that proposal would force a disparity between our cost of assigning these account numbers versus BellSouth's. That disparity was not know to either of our teams when this was originally discussed. This leaves us with two acceptable proposals from the original set of 4. We need to get your response to these other two.

On Directory Listings USOCs, we were told today that we needed to give you an answer by Friday whether to take USOCs off these orders or leave them on. We're analyzing that as quickly as we can. While we'd prefer to remove them, the coding changes on our side to remove the USOCs could further jeopardize our scheduled market entry. So we're looking to see whether their removal is doable without further schedule risk. We've been told that unless we answer by Friday, BellSouth will be unable to accommodate removal until August. I would ask for your flexibility about the Friday deadline for two reasons: first, we weren't told until today that the Friday deadline existed. And second, the reason we have this issue at all, is that BellSouth insisted on the USOCs being on the orders, then changed its mind, and didn't communicate the change to us until late last week.

Those are the critical immediate items, Scott. I would add in closing that we're still concerned about the stability of BellSouth's EDI7 implementation. We've seen only a high level summary of the root causes and resolutions for multiple and sometimes conflicting EDI7 responses. And our testing team tells me we've had another instance of this since the problems were supposedly licked. I don't want root cause analysis to delay your team in getting closure with us on the aforementioned critical issues. But I don't want to lose sight of the problem, either. The stability of the interface may have improved, but I don't think the interface is solid yet.

Please let me know as soon as you can how we can move forward on these show stoppers.

ATTACHMENT 16

> From:
>
Gary.Romanick1@bridge.bellsouth.com[SMTP:Gary.Romanick1@bridge.bellsouth.com
]
> Sent: Friday, July 17, 1998 3:45 PM
> To: Nelson, Pamela A, NCAM NCAM
> Cc: Jan.Burriss1@bridge.bellsouth.com;
> Debra.D.Stockton@bridge.bellsouth.com
> Subject: 1/98 LEO Discrepancy
>
> Pam,
>
> This is a follow up to your question regarding discrepancies in the LEO
> Guide and the BellSouth Reject Binder. This issue was discussed by the Local
> Ordering Change Control Process. The BellSouth reject binder was published
> last November and has never been updated. Since the Reject Binder is outdated,
> please do not use it as a point of reference.
>
> BellSouth is aware that discrepancies do exist in the LEO IG and we
> are working toward identifying those discrepancies, but this process will
> take time. However, if you discover additional discrepancies, we would
> certainly appreciate your sharing those discrepancies with us so we can correct
> them.
>
> Thanks
>
> Gary
>

ATTACHMENT 17

/O=ATT/OU=USGA01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BRADBURY

From: Hill, James S (Jim), NCAM NCAM
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 1998 11:39 AM
To: Gray, Valerie
Cc: Travers, Stephen; Williamson, Jill; Nelson, Pamela; Bradbury, J
Subject: Ordering Guidelines Documentation Comparison

Valerie,

Attached is a comparison of three BellSouth documents which you have referred me to in your email messages dated March 02, 1998 "UNE Documents" and March 25, 1998 "Proper forms for UNE Ordering." The comparison depicts discrepancies in BellSouth's requirements for ordering unbundled network elements. These inconsistencies reflect only the discoveries made by AT&T to-date regarding unbundled network elements ordering and are not all inclusive of the disparity between BellSouth's documents.

The documents are as follows:
1. BellSouth's Ordering Guide for Manual Orders (fax)
2. BellSouth's Port/Loop Requirements (Eddie English document)
3. BellSouth's LEO Guide on the Web for electronic ordering (EDI, EDI/PC)

The attached chart has four columns - the first references the documents listed above, the second column is the particular field in question, the third column indicates what BST shows as the requirement for that field, and the last one expounds on the requirement, if necessary.

The inconsistencies found in BellSouth's documentation make the ordering process very confusing for AT&T. Also, the Unbundled Network Elements Platform is not addressed in BellSouth's documentation. AT&T must guess as to what BellSouth needs or requires on UNE Platform orders.

Please respond by Wednesday, May 20, 1998 explaining BellSouth's plan to reconcile requirements and instructions and to document detailed instructions for ordering the Unbundled Network Elements Platform.

Questions can be directed to me on (404) 810-4929.

Sincerely,

Jim Hill

BST Ordering
ideline Comparison.d