ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD & EVANS, P.L.L.C.
1301 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1000 WEST
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3317

(202) 326-7900
FACSIMILE:
(202) 326-7999

MICHAEL K. KELLOGG
PETER W. HUBER
MARK C. HANSEN
K. CHRIS TODD
MARK L. EVANS
AUSTIN C. SCHLICK
STEVEN F. BENZ

NEIL M. GORSUCH
GEOFFREY M. KLINEBERG
REID M. FIGEL
HENK BRANDS
SEAN A. LEV
COURTNEY SIMMONS ELWOOD
EVAN T. LEO

February 25, 2000

Ex Parte Submission

RECEIVED
FEB 25 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Magalie Roman Salas, Esq.
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: *Application of SBC Communications Inc. Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Texas*, CC Docket No. 00-4

Dear Ms. Salas:

Enclosed for filing please find an original and one copy of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Accessible Letter No. CLEC00-043, entitled "Final Minutes for February 8, 2000 Change Management Process Meeting – Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas" (released Feb. 22, 2000). This document is being provided at the direct request of Commission staff.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this matter.

Sincerely,

Austin C. Schlick

cc: Ms. Stephens
Ms. Wright
Ms. Farroba, Texas PUC
Ms. Heisler, DOJ
ITS

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE

Accessible

Southwestern Bell

"Final Minutes for February 8, 2000 Change Management Process Meeting – Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas"

Date: February 22, 2000

Number: **CLEC00-043**

Contact: Southwestern Bell Account Manager

This Accessible Letter serves to distribute the Final Minutes from the February 8, 2000 Change Management Process meeting. In the attachments you will find the following:

- Final Minutes
- Attendees List for those in attendance either in person or via conference bridge
- 12-Month Development View
- Table of Service Code, NC, NCI and USOC Changes
- Action Item Log
- CLEC Change Request Monthly Summary

Draft minutes were distributed to participants for comment. Comments received were incorporated into the Final Minutes.

Please direct any questions to your Account Manager.

Attachments

SWBT Change Management Process Meeting

Three Bell Plaza, 12th Floor, Room 12A, Dallas, TX
Tuesday, February 8, 2000 ~ 9:00 AM – 12:30 PM
Final Minutes

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
SBC opened the meeting by welcoming all participants to the Change Management Process (CMP) meeting. A list of attendees is included as Attachment 1 and the agenda is included as Attachment 2 to these minutes.

PHASE II LIDB UPDATE
SBC confirmed that LIDB Phase II could not be moved up from the fourth quarter. LIDB Phase II will remain in the December release with a target of March for the initial requirements. It was agreed that it would be helpful to hold a sidebar meeting with the CLECs to get input on the business requirements. The possible dates for this meeting include 2/15 or 2/16. SBC agreed to finalize logistics for this meeting and send out the information via an Accessible Letter.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will finalize logistics for this sidebar meeting and send out the information via an Accessible Letter.

12-MONTH DEVELOPMENT VIEW
SBC reviewed the updated 12-Month Development View, which is included as Attachment 3 to these minutes.

CLECS requested clarification on the State Limitation on Data Access based upon OSS Agreement enhancement for the 3/18 pre-ordering release. SBC responded that CLECs would not be able to access data unless there is a signed Interconnection agreement that includes access to SBC's OSS for that state.

The address validation edits proposed for the 4/29 release will be discussed further at a CLEC User Forum follow up meeting scheduled for February 24th. CLECs will hold their comments on the proposed address validation edits until they receive additional information at the follow-up meeting.

CLECs inquired about the other process improvement edits proposed for 4/29. SBC reviewed the additional edits.

CLECs inquired if the Phase 1 Supp Error Processing is an additional flow-through enhancement. SBC responded that it is.

MCIW said that it looked as though the 7/22 release would be a big release and wondered if SBC envisioned the need for a testing window greater than 30 days. SBC responded that it would determine the need for a longer test period once the final requirements were completed. Birch stated that with versioning, CLECs would be able to stay on the old version if a CLEC was not ready to implement the new release, so a longer test period

may not be needed. SBC agreed with this point. Birch inquired if all of the changes/references to xDSL were driven by the Plan of Record. SBC responded that it was.

MCIW expressed concern that they receive requirements that "work". The 3/18 DataGate release requirements state that there are records that should be available, but are not. AT&T is concerned that line sharing is scheduled for the 4/29 release, and the requirements are still under development. SBC acknowledged the concern, and stated that a draft of the LSR will be distributed on 2/14. This is not to be considered initial requirements, but a draft to provide as much information as currently available.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will provide a draft of the LSR for line-sharing via Accessible Letter on 2/14.

UPDATE ON 13-STATE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

SBC reported that the Drafting Team would meet this afternoon. The 13-State CMP draft document will be presented at the 2/17 walk-through meeting in Chicago. The document will be distributed via Accessible Letter the week of February 10th to give CLECs an opportunity to review the document prior to the meeting.

CLEC INTERFACE PROPOSAL/RECOMMENDATIONS/ADDRESS VALIDATION

1/15 LIDB Release Walk-Through

Based on the problems Birch experienced with the 1/15 LIDB release, Birch suggested including an extensive walk-through on releases as part of the CMP. Birch felt that one of the major problems with the 1/15 release was the lack of communication. Going forward, there should be a plan to do a walk-through of releases to discuss the trigger points, what takes place when, and each step of the process. The walk-through should include the LSC and M&P. This will provide CLECs as much information as possible. Birch stated that lessons should be learned from the mistakes that were made, so that the same mistakes would not be made in the future.

SBC stated that it is taking steps for setting up walk-throughs with the LSC prior to a release to review requirements. SBC plans to make sure the LSC is provided with clear M&P and they receive necessary training.

CLECs commented that the LSRs that were in the pipeline before the release date were overlooked, which is a major concern. CLECs need reassurance that things like this will not cause problems. Birch stated that it was not aware, until after the fact, that for rejects/jeopardies after the FOC, the LSC manually modifies the due date in the C, D and N service orders. If the LSC misses the D order, the customer will be out of service. Birch indicated that if CLECs would have understood the LSC M&P ahead of time, they might not have agreed to the changes.

AT&T agreed that including M&P as part of the CMP is important in order to get sufficient details on the releases. Birch stated that the goal is to minimize the amount of manual intervention. SBC asked for clarification regarding Birch's opinion that the new

edits will cause more manual intervention. SBC explained that the purpose of the edits is to catch errors up-front and return the errors back to the CLECs to eliminate manual intervention. Currently, there is a lot of manual intervention because there are not sufficient edits in place to reject the orders earlier in the process. With the new process, the LSR is returned to the CLEC for corrections up-front. Birch stated the point is that there is not enough information in the draft requirements about what the impact to processes will be. SBC replied that it hopes to communicate additional/clarifying information at the 2/24 meeting. It is SBC's goal to eliminate manual intervention.

AT&T proposed that a walk-through of each release be added as a recurring step in the process. SBC stated that it planned to include a representative from the LSC to participate in the CMP meetings.

SBC said that it could schedule a walk-through during the two-week reply and comment cycle after the release of the initial requirements. If there are any significant items, another walk-through after the release of the final requirements may be required. MCIW stated that the walk-through would also be beneficial for those individuals responsible for writing the requirements in that the individual would receive input/comments back from the CLEC community on its clarity, accuracy, and thoroughness. There were discussions regarding whether the walk-through would be as successful if it was held via conference call or face-to-face. SBC stated that it would discuss this issue with the Drafting Team.

Birch stated that scheduling walk-throughs for releases would be very helpful. The CLECs could provide feedback and other items for consideration before implementation of the release. Agreement was reached to conduct a walk-through of the 4/29 release on 2/24, in conjunction with the next CLEC User Forum. The discussion of the address validation edits was also added to the agenda for this meeting.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will conduct a walk-through of the 4/29 Initial Requirements in conjunction with the next CLEC User Forum scheduled for 2/24 from 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM CST in Dallas.

SBC reported on the 1/15 LIDB Release. After this release went live, it was discovered that orders issued prior to the 1/15 release did not post. Also, LVAS, a downstream system, did not properly populate product tables. Some orders after implementation failed to process correctly.

MCIW inquired when SBC performs its test, does the testing process go all the way through, end-to-end. SBC responded that testing did not get through to the posting cycle in billing. SBC monitored each step of the test all the way through LVAS. MCIW commented that it thought SBC was testing end-to-end. SBC responded that the test worked as expected, it was the production system that did not update the tables in a timely manner. MCIW asked SBC if testing is done after SBC implements the release on the production platform before the release is open to CLEC use. SBC responded that SBC testing is considered complete prior to making the release available to CLECs in production and that, generally speaking, testing is not conducted once the release is loaded into production. –

SBC stated that CLEC joint testing goes through service order creation, but it does not go through to billing and provisioning. In the future, SBC will get confirmation from those systems in test and production to make sure that appropriate tables are updated. Also, SBC will test for orders prepared prior to the release date, and will run the test through the posting cycle.

Birch commented that not to consider orders in process is a significant oversight. Birch asked what SBC is going to do to prevent this type of problems in the future and to correct its internal testing process. SBC responded that it is aware of the problems and will ensure that in the future, SBC will test more thoroughly and extend the test to go through billing to validate posting.

Birch stated that it cannot suffer through another release with these types of problems. Birch lost a week's worth of revenue due to the problems. SBC acknowledged Birch's concern and frustration. SBC stated that a fix for the problem was implemented within four days of the release. Birch stated that it did not get confirmation until the following Monday, which was one week after the implementation.

Birch said there were many fundamental oversights of SBC's testing process and expressed a great deal of concern that SBC did not take these fundamental steps into account in its testing procedures. Birch also expressed concerns regarding the upcoming 7/22 release, and the degree of testing that will be done. AT&T asked if it would be possible for SBC to test end-to-end before the CLECs get a new release now with versioning to ensure it will work. SBC responded that it would look into the possibility of running a test through to the billing cycle.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will check into the possibility of running a test through to the billing cycle.

MCIW stated that it had requested a process flow on LIDB. MCIW said it would be helpful to see the whole process flow related to the service order and at what point LIDB will be updated.

Birch stated that it thought a request for a process flow was made previously. CLECs would like to see the flow with trigger points for N, C, and D orders, the processes and functions for each order, and what impacts LIDB.

Birch said that it received a SOC after 24 hours, but if the order does not post, the C is completed and gets SOC'd, the N or D orders do not get SOC'd. If the N order is not typed complete, then it does not update LIDB. MCIW said that LIDB is not populated until the N order posts. SBC responded that certain things get done at SOC vs. other things when the N order posts. CLECs felt the prior explanations were unclear. Birch commented that the requirements need to be documented accurately. SBC stated that it is currently working on the request to document the process flow showing what happens at what point in the process. SBC will provide a draft of the process flow via an Accessible Letter prior to the 2/24 meeting to give CLECs an opportunity to review the information.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will provide a draft of the process flow via Accessible Letter prior to the 2/24 meeting.

Birch inquired if SBC has made a commitment that future requirements will be complete and accurate, systems and processes will be considered, and that coding is in line with the requirements. SBC responded that it recognizes the need for improving the documentation and communications of release requirements and will take steps necessary to improve the process.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will review testing plans for LIDB and get CLEC input at LIDB meeting to be scheduled for March or April.

MCIW inquired if testing could be placed on the agenda for the next CMP meeting. SBC responded that it will add this as an agenda item for the next meeting.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will add the discussion of LIDB testing to the agenda for the next CMP meeting scheduled for 3/14.

AT&T inquired about the EDI mapping and testing meeting that was planned for 2/3 in St. Louis. SBC stated that an Accessible Letter went out canceling the EDI requirement portion of the meeting on 2/3. Since this topic is being addressed by the Plan of Record and the collaborative meetings, it was thought to be a duplication of effort. SBC is trying to reschedule the testing portion of the meeting for the week of 3/6 in St. Louis. CLECs agreed that a start time of 10:00 AM would be preferable to allow individuals time to fly in that morning. The first choice on dates is 3/9 and the second choice is 3/8.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will provide logistics via Accessible Letter for the rescheduled meeting on testing, which will be held in St. Louis on 3/8 or 3/9.

Notification of Service Order Creation Procedure (Conversion with New Activity)
There was concern expressed that the Accessible Letter did not mention the fact that when there is a conversion order with new activity, SBC automatically creates two new service orders. SBC stated that although it would create two orders internally, the CLEC will receive a single FOC so it did not think there would be CLEC impact. A request was made to include this type of information in the notifications. SBC will send out this information via Accessible Letter.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will send information on the service order creation procedure in the 4/29/2000 release via Accessible Letter.

MCIW expressed concern that the development cycle will be very tight for 4/29 and wondered when the final requirements would be distributed. SBC responded that the final requirements couldn't go out until the CLECs have had an opportunity to provide input at the 2/24 meeting. SBC stated that if it would be helpful, it can provide draft/proposed final requirements for CLECs to have additional time to review the requirements. CLECs agreed that it would be helpful to have draft requirements to review with their internal SMEs prior to the 2/24 meeting.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will send draft requirements via Accessible Letter before the 2/24 meeting.

MCIW requested that the title of the Accessible Letter be clear as to the exception or expedited request. SBC responded that the TPUC issued guidelines on the wording of the title and how it should be stated. SBC will ensure that the title of the Accessible Letter will state that it is an expedited or exception request.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will ensure that the titles of Accessible Letters for expedited / exception requests are clearly noted as such.

Processing of LSRs on the one Order – "C"

Birch would like an explanation as to why there is not parity and why SBC has to break everything apart and put it all back together. CLECs want to know why SBC cannot do just one order, and not have the C, D, and N order. The CLECs said that they keep hearing that SBC is working on this issue, but they want to know what it is SBC is working on and to understand the status and the hurdles. SBC responded that it is currently working on the issue and evaluating its impacts. SBC stated that while it is evaluating this request, SBC is also looking at what can be done in the interim to make the existing process work better.

Birch stated that this request/issue has been on the table for an inordinate amount of time. Perhaps the request needs to be escalated to the next level of the organization. Birch would like to know when SBC will provide the CLECs with a target date for a status or some information.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will add a discussion of the expected target date for providing information on this request to the agenda for the next CMP meeting.

Reschedule Change Management Process Meetings in 2000

A request was made to reschedule the CMP meetings in 2000 because the scheduled meeting dates conflict with Bell Atlantic's schedule. CLECs are not able to attend both meetings due to this conflict. After some discussion, agreement was reached to change the meetings from the second Tuesday of each month to the first Wednesday of each month with a 10:00 AM start time. It was agreed to leave the March meeting on 3/14, as previously scheduled. The CMP meetings will change to the new schedule beginning with the April 5th CMP meeting.

SERVICE CODE, NC, NCI AND USOC CHANGES

SBC reviewed the table of service codes, which was distributed at the meeting and is included as Attachment 4 of these minutes. This table represents several combinations of Loop and Switch Port service code assignments that require a change effective 4/29. CLECs reviewed the handout. This table will be the basis of an Accessible Letter that will be sent. Standard codes will now be used in place of non-standard ones. The CLECS will need to use the new codes or their LSRs will get an error effective 4/29. This is not a new edit; it is the content of the field that the edit will be based upon that is changing.

SBC asked if CLECs want to see these kinds of changes, NC and NCI code changes, follow the timelines in the CMP, or implemented on an exception basis. AT&T thinks this should be included in the CMP.

SBC stated if a CLEC uses LEX in the 5 states to order Loops, then the CLEC would have to assign the circuit ID.

AT&T suggested that SBC maintain and accept both the old and new codes for a period of time and let the old codes drop off eventually. SBC agreed to check into this.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will send out information regarding the NC and NCI code changes via Accessible Letter early next week.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will check into the possibility of maintaining and accepting both the old and new codes for a period of time and let the old codes drop off eventually.

PRIOR ACTION ITEMS/STATUS/UPDATES
SBC reviewed the Action Item Log, which was updated and included as Attachment 5 to these minutes.

A question was raised (regarding Action Item #3-12/7/99) as to why RPON has been delayed beyond the 4/29 release and when RPON will be scheduled. SBC responded that it would check into this and report back at the next CMP meeting.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will check into the RPON delay and provide status information at the next CMP meeting.

CLECs would like an Accessible Letter on RPON because of commitments that were made at the Texas PUC hearings on M&P and RPON being available in 2000.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will communicate RPON status via Accessible Letter.

CLECs requested that a status on the availability of ordering duplicate (dual/concurrent) service (Action Item #3-1/11/2000) be added to the agenda for the next CMP meeting.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will add the discussion of the status on the availability of ordering duplicate service to the agenda for the next CMP meeting.

OTHER DISCUSSION TOPICS FROM CLECS

AT&T - Batch Ordering:
AT&T wanted to discuss the issue of batches of LSRs sent to SBC. AT&T said that SBC set a limit of 500 EDI orders per hour to process. AT&T is concerned about SBC's capacity. SBC said that AT&T had to temporarily switch to batch processing of LSRs, and that SBC's system is designed for real-time transactions. AT&T switched from real-time transactions to batch, without notifying SBC. SBC set the limit in order to minimize the negative impact on other CLECs sending EDI orders real-time. This was SBC's

solution to help AT&T through this period until it can get back to sending normal real-time transactions. SBC did this to set an optimal rate.

AT&T asked how this relates to July when they sent larger volumes. SBC indicated that this issue is different. The systems has been built to handle large volumes of transactions sent in a real-time mode, not batch. AT&T's mode of one transaction per file creates a lot of overhead. SBC took measures to process these as a combined transaction file. Batch transactions have the effect of dumping hundreds of orders from a single CLEC into queue at a single moment, thus delaying the real-time orders from other CLECs.

The "number" 500/hour was chosen to mirror the normal rate of orders AT&T would send in if sent interactively based on historical data. If SBC sees overall volumes increasing, it has measures to increase capacity as needed. 2000/day was based on CLECs forecasts per the TPUC. SBC's LSC can staff for batch processing but SBC needs to know about this and plan for it.

SBC reiterated that it can handle large volumes, but AT&T was "hogging" the system by dumping large batch files. This caused LSRs from other CLECs to queue up behind these batch files and delayed processing their orders.

AT&T asked what it would need to do going forward. Birch explained that it doesn't appear that there are rules for this. SBC said that it is geared up to handle interactive transactions, so if CLECs anticipate having exceptional volumes or intends to switch to batch processing, SBC needs to be notified to work through this exception with that particular CLEC. AT&T said this immediate situation is working and assured other CLECs that AT&T was not impacting their processing. SBC said that nothing is put on hold. It is on a first in, first out basis. The 500/hour is not a "capacity" issue.

SBC inquired if it needs to send out an Accessible Letter stating that its EDI ordering system is transaction-based. If a CLEC has a batch need, the CLEC needs to let its Account Manager know and SBC will work with the CLEC.

CLECs suggested that the "rules" need to be documented somewhere. SBC indicated that performance measurements would also need to be looked at because they were agreed to based on a transaction based process and not on batch.

SBC and the CLECs agreed to close the discussion and bring it up again if needed in a future meeting.

MCIW – Information/Notification Timing for Partial Migrations Meeting:
MCIW indicated that it was concerned that no information was provided with the Accessible Letter regarding the partial migrations meeting. Also, MCIW has an issue with the date, time and short notification of the meeting. The meeting is scheduled for 8:00 AM CST. Since, there is no documentation/information regarding what is to be discussed at the meeting, it is difficult to determine if CLECs should make an effort to attend. CLECs requested that the meeting be rescheduled if possible, and to be given more information on the topics for discussion. The CLECs will get the information too late to react.

ACTION ITEM: SBC will see if the meeting on partial migrations can be rescheduled and provide more information to CLECs.

Topics from Other Meetings Impacting CMP:

CLECs indicated that SBC needs to tie the Plan of Record and Line Sharing efforts into CMP. Dates/Enhancements are being agreed to at various meetings and causing concerns on CMP aspects. There does not seem to be the proper knowledge of CMP. Comments are being made at these meetings that "this will be handled by CMP", but the CLECs that also attend the CMP meetings are not hearing them being addressed.

STATUS OF CLEC CHANGE REQUESTS

SBC distributed the updated Change Request Summary, a copy of which is included as Attachment 6. CLECs agreed that since the meeting ran beyond the scheduled end time, the Change Request Summary would be reviewed at the next CMP meeting.

COMMENTS ON SIDEBAR MEETINGS

No sidebar meetings took place since the last CMP meeting.

EVALUATION OF CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Time did not allow for discussion on this topic.

FUTURE MEETING LOGISTICS

The next CMP meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 3/14.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:40 PM.

SWBT Change Management Process Meeting
Three Bell Plaza, 12th Floor, Room 12A, Dallas, TX
February 8, 2000 ~ 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Attendees List

Attachment 1

Attendee	Company Name	Email Address
*Aguilar, Kathleen	Virtual Network	kaguilar@vhq.net
*Althayer, Tom	Northpoint	
Bannecker, Bob	SBC Communications	
Bontrager, Daryn	Birch Telecom	dbontrager@birch.com
Brauchle, Rich	AT&T	rbrauchle@ems.att.com
Chambers, Julie	AT&T	jschambers@att.com
Coleman, Karen	MCIWorldcom	karen.a.coleman@wcom.com
Coughlan, Patti	AT&T	pcoughlan@att.com
*Desborough, Carol	MCI WorldCom	carol.desborough@wcom.com
*Eggen, Mary Ann	SBC Communications	
Evans, Sandy	Sprint	sandra.k.evans@mail.sprint.com
*Garcia, Roy	SBC Communications	
*Gunnels, Mike	AT&T	mwgunnels@att.com
Hardy, Eva	SBC Communications	exhardy@pacbell.com
Head, Alisa	Great West Services	heada@greatwestmgmt.com
Hines, Chris	SBC Communications	ch1787@txmail.sbc.com
Johns, Ronnie	Allegiance Telecom	ronnie.johns@algx.com
Johnson, Jean	SBC Communications	
Kendall, Roseann	MCI Worldcom	roseann.kendall@wcom.com
*Kettler, Patti	Birch Telecom	pkettler@birchtel.com
King, Kathy	SBC Communications	mkking@pacbell.com
*Martin, Ross	Excel Communications	ross.martin@geis.ge.com
McMillon, Terri	MCI WorldCom	terri.mcmillon@wcom.com
Orr, Gerrie	SBC Communications	
Pinick, Paul	Birch	pinickp@birch.com

*via Conference Bridge

SWBT Change Management Process Meeting

Three Bell Plaza, 12th Floor, Room 12A, Dallas, TX

February 8, 2000 ~ 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Attendees List

Attachment 1

Attendee	Company Name	Email Address
*Protheroe, Pam	AT&T	protheroe@att.com
Roberts, Donna	Sprint	donna.roberts@mail.sprint.com
Schneer, Kenneth	Sage	kschneer@sagetelecom.net
*Schribner, Dwight	MCI WorldCom	
*Thomas, Betty	Excel Communications, Inc.	bthomas@excel.com
Weber, Marilyn	SBC Communications	
Weissgerber, Marilyn	SBC Communications	
Williams, Kevin	GTECC	kevin.williams@cc.gte.com

*via Conference Bridge

Change Management Process Meeting

Date: Tuesday, February 8, 2000 **Time:** 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Central Standard Time
Location: Three Bell Plaza, 12th Floor, Room12A, Dallas, Texas
Conference Bridge: 1-800-220-0688, **Passcode:** 925-277-3873#

Final Agenda

TOPIC
♦ **Welcome and Introductions**
♦ **Update on Year 2000 Enhancements**
♦ **Phase II LIDB Update**
♦ **12-Month Development View**
♦ **Update on 13-State Change Management Process**
♦ **CLEC Interface Proposals/Recommendations**
♦ **1/15 LIDB Release Walk-Through**
♦ **Address Validation – 4/29 Release Walk-Through**
♦ **Notification of Service Order Creation Procedure (conversion with new activity)**
♦ **Processing of LSRs on One Order – "C"**
♦ **Reschedule CMP Meetings in 2000**
♦ **Prior Action Items/Status/Updates**
♦ **Status of CLEC Change Requests**
♦ **Evaluation of CMP Effectiveness**
♦ **Comments on Sidebar Meeting Minutes**
♦ **Future Meeting Logistics**
♦ **Summary and Wrap-up**

SWBT 12-Month Development View
Version 6.0

Change Log (2/8/00)

Attachment 3

Quarter	Interface	Enhancement Change
1Q00	EDI / LEX	Added "Additional Manual Reject Codes and Jeopardy Reasons"
	DataGate	Moved "Rate Group Information" to 3Q00
	EDI / CORBA	Changed Release Date from 3/26 to 3/18 Deleted "Enhancements to be determined" Added the Following Enhancements: ♦ Feature / Service Inquiry by WTN ♦ State Limitation
	Verigate	Added the Following Enhancements: ♦ PIC / LPIC Button enhancement to Address Verification Screen ♦ Trunking Enhancement for CSR Moved "Rate Group Information" to 2Q00
	EASE - Consumer	Deleted "Product / Feature Enhancement to be determined"
	Upgraded EASE – Business	Deleted "Product / Feature Enhancement to be determined"
	SORD	Deleted "Product / Feature Enhancement to be determined"
2Q00	EDI/LEX	Added the Following Enhancements: ♦ Address Validation Edits ♦ Process Improvements Edits ♦ Line Sharing (Changed from TBD to 4/29 Release date)
	DataGate	Deleted "Enhancements to be determined"
	EDI/CORBA	Deleted "Enhancements to be determined" Added "Loop Qual Enhancement" from 3Q00
	Verigate	Deleted "Enhancements to be determined" Deleted 6/25 Release Date Moved "Rate Group Information" Enhancement to 3Q00
	POS	Deleted "Feature Enhancements"
	Order Status	Deleted "FID Lookup enhancement"

SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT. SWBT's Development View reflects SWBT's intent to modify or enhance the OSS offered by SWBT, as of the time that the View was prepared. Facts and circumstances upon which the View is based (e.g., Local Wholesale Customer demands, regulatory obligations) may change over time. Accordingly, SWBT reserves the right to modify the View, in its sole discretion.

In addition, SWBT is sharing its Development View with Local Wholesale Customers in an effort to encourage meaningful discussions between SWBT and Local Wholesale Customers regarding SWBT's perception of their needs or desires for future OSS modifications and enhancements. In some instances, such discussions may lead to changes in SWBT's Development View.

Because SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT, Local Wholesale Customers should not rely on the Development View. The official notices disseminated by SWBT announcing anticipated OSS modifications and enhancements reflect SWBT's actual plan.

SWBT 12-Month Development View
Version 6.0

Change Log (2/8/00)

Attachment 3

Quarter	Interface	Enhancement Change
3Q00	EDI/LEX	Added the Following Enhancements: ◆ Transfer of Call Notes* for UNE ◆ XDSL Enhancements Additional Flow-Through Spectrum Mgmt Services ◆ Resale Edits Package ◆ UNE Resale Due Date Validation ◆ Phase 1 Supp – Supp Error Processing ◆ Versioning ◆ Loop Qual ADSL –17,500' ◆ Loop Qual Interface, Rejects if not qualified ◆ AECN Edit ◆ Due Date Process Improvement Phase 1 ◆ Flow-Through Enhancements - Additional Supp and Transfer Call Option (TCOPT)
	LEX	Added the Following Enhancements: ◆ Test Environment ◆ LSR Archive Process ◆ Save As Export for Search Results ◆ Template Update Capability
	DataGate	Deleted "Enhancements to be determined" Added 7/22 Release Date Added "Rate Group Information" Enhancement from 1Q00 Added "Versioning Support"
	EDI / CORBA	Deleted "Enhancements to be determined" Added 7/22 Release Date Added the Following Enhancements: ◆ Moved "Loop Qual Enhancement" to 2Q00 ◆ Versioning ◆ SSL3
	Verigate	Deleted "Enhancements to be determined"
	EASE - Consumer	Added 7/22 Release Date

SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT. SWBT's Development View reflects SWBT's intent to modify or enhance the OSS offered by SWBT, as of the time that the View was prepared. Facts and circumstances upon which the View is based (e.g., Local Wholesale Customer demands, regulatory obligations) may change over time. Accordingly, SWBT reserves the right to modify the View, in its sole discretion.

In addition, SWBT is sharing its Development View with Local Wholesale Customers in an effort to encourage meaningful discussions between SWBT and Local Wholesale Customers regarding SWBT's perception of their needs or desires for future OSS modifications and enhancements. In some instances, such discussions may lead to changes in SWBT's Development View.

Because SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT, Local Wholesale Customers should not rely on the Development View. The official notices disseminated by SWBT announcing anticipated OSS modifications and enhancements reflect SWBT's actual plan.

SWBT 12-Month Development View
Version 6.0

Change Log (2/8/00)

Attachment 3

Quarter	Interface	Enhancement Change
3Q00 (continued)	Upgraded EASE – Business	Added 7/22 Release Date
	SORD	Added 7/22 Release Date Added "OCN Standardization" Enhancement
	POS	Added "Copy, Save As, and Export Capability" Enhancement
	Order Status	Added "Feature Enhancements to be determined"
4Q00	EDI/LEX	Added the Following Enhancements: ◆ LIDB Phase II (Includes Change Activity) ◆ Additional Enhancements to be determined ◆ OCN Standardization
	DataGate	Added "Enhancements to be determined"
	Verigate	Added "Enhancements to be determined"

SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT. SWBT's Development View reflects SWBT's intent to modify or enhance the OSS offered by SWBT, as of the time that the View was prepared. Facts and circumstances upon which the View is based (e.g., Local Wholesale Customer demands, regulatory obligations) may change over time. Accordingly, SWBT reserves the right to modify the View, in its sole discretion.

In addition, SWBT is sharing its Development View with Local Wholesale Customers in an effort to encourage meaningful discussions between SWBT and Local Wholesale Customers regarding SWBT's perception of their needs or desires for future OSS modifications and enhancements. In some instances, such discussions may lead to changes in SWBT's Development View.

Because SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT, Local Wholesale Customers should not rely on the Development View. The official notices disseminated by SWBT announcing anticipated OSS modifications and enhancements reflect SWBT's actual plan.

SWBT 12-Month Development View
Version 6.0
(2/8/2000)

Attachment 3

Release	Category	Interface	Date	Enhancement
1Q00	LSR Ordering	EDI / LEX	1/15 Special Release	• LIDB (Line Identification Database) • Additional Manual Reject Codes and Jeopardy Reasons
	Pre-Ordering (App to App)	DataGate	3/18	• Loop Qualification Enhancement • State Limitation on Data Access based upon OSS Agreement
		EDI / CORBA	3/18	• Feature/Service Inquiry by WTN • State Limitation
	Pre-Ordering GUI	Verigate	3/18	• Loop Qualification Enhancement • State Limitation on Data Access based upon OSS Agreement • PIC/LPIC Button Enhancement to Address Verification Screen • Trunking Enhancement for CSR
2Q00	LSR Ordering	EDI/LEX	4/29	Accessible Letter CLECSS00-008 • Address Validation Edits • Process Improvement Edits • Line Sharing
	Pre-Ordering (App to App)	EDI / CORBA	4/29	• Loop Qual Enhancement
	Proprietary Order Interface	EASE - Consumer	TBD	• Product / Feature Enhancement to be determined
		Upgraded EASE – Business	TBD	• Product / Feature Enhancement to be determined
		SORD	TBD	• Product / Feature Enhancement to be determined

SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT. SWBT's Development View reflects SWBT's intent to modify or enhance the OSS offered by SWBT, as of the time that the View was prepared. Facts and circumstances upon which the View is based (e.g., Local Wholesale Customer demands, regulatory obligations) may change over time. Accordingly, SWBT reserves the right to modify the View, in its sole discretion.

In addition, SWBT is sharing its Development View with Local Wholesale Customers in an effort to encourage meaningful discussions between SWBT and Local Wholesale Customers regarding SWBT's perception of their needs or desires for future OSS modifications and enhancements. In some instances, such discussions may lead to changes in SWBT's Development View.

Because SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT, Local Wholesale Customers should not rely on the Development View. The official notices disseminated by SWBT announcing anticipated OSS modifications and enhancements reflect SWBT's actual plan.

SWBT 12-Month Development View
Version 6.0
(2/8/2000)

Attachment 3

Release	Category	Interface	Date	Enhancement
3Q00	LSR Ordering	EDI/LEX	7/22	• Transfer of Call Notes* for UNE • XDSL Enhancements Additional Flowthrough Spectrum Management Services • Resale Edits Package • UNE Resale Due Date Validation • Phase 1 Supp – Supp Error Processing • Versioning • Loop Qual ADSL –17,500' • Loop Qual' Interface, Rejects if not qualified • AECN Edit • Due Date Process Improvement Phase 1
			TBD	Flow-Through Enhancements: • Additional Supp Due Date Changes • Transfer Call Option (TCOPT)
	LSR Ordering GUI	LEX	7/22	• Test Environment • LSR Archive Process • Save As Export for Search Results • Template Update Capability
	Pre-Ordering (App to App)	DataGate	7/22	• Rate Group Information • Versioning Support
		EDI / CORBA	7/22	Accessible Letter CLECSS00-007 • Versioning • SSL3

SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT. SWBT's Development View reflects SWBT's intent to modify or enhance the OSS offered by SWBT, as of the time that the View was prepared. Facts and circumstances upon which the View is based (e.g., Local Wholesale Customer demands, regulatory obligations) may change over time. Accordingly, SWBT reserves the right to modify the View, in its sole discretion.

In addition, SWBT is sharing its Development View with Local Wholesale Customers in an effort to encourage meaningful discussions between SWBT and Local Wholesale Customers regarding SWBT's perception of their needs or desires for future OSS modifications and enhancements. In some instances, such discussions may lead to changes in SWBT's Development View.

Because SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT, Local Wholesale Customers should not rely on the Development View. The official notices disseminated by SWBT announcing anticipated OSS modifications and enhancements reflect SWBT's actual plan.

SWBT 12-Month Development View
Version 6.0
(2/8/2000)

Attachment 3

Release	Category	Interface	Date	Enhancement
3Q00 (continued)	Pre-Ordering GUI	Verigate	7/22	• Rate Group Information
	Proprietary Order Interface	EASE - Consumer	7/22	• Product / Feature Enhancement to be determined
		Upgraded EASE – Business	7/22	• Product / Feature Enhancement to be determined
		SORD	7/22	• OCN Standardization • Product/Feature Enhancement to be determined
	Order Interface GUI	POS	7/9	• Copy, Save as, and Export capability (CCR 99-011B)
		Order Status	8/6	• Product/ Feature Enhancement to be determined
4Q00	LSR Ordering	EDI/LEX	12/02	• LIDB Phase II (Includes Change Activity) • Additional Enhancements to be determined
			TBD	• OCN Standardization
	Pre-Ordering (App to App)	DataGate	TBD	• Enhancements to be determined
	Pre-Ordering GUI	Verigate	TBD	• Enhancements to be determined

SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT. SWBT's Development View reflects SWBT's intent to modify or enhance the OSS offered by SWBT, as of the time that the View was prepared. Facts and circumstances upon which the View is based (e.g., Local Wholesale Customer demands, regulatory obligations) may change over time. Accordingly, SWBT reserves the right to modify the View, in its sole discretion.

In addition, SWBT is sharing its Development View with Local Wholesale Customers in an effort to encourage meaningful discussions between SWBT and Local Wholesale Customers regarding SWBT's perception of their needs or desires for future OSS modifications and enhancements. In some instances, such discussions may lead to changes in SWBT's Development View.

Because SWBT's Development View is subject to change and is not binding on SWBT, Local Wholesale Customers should not rely on the Development View. The official notices disseminated by SWBT announcing anticipated OSS modifications and enhancements reflect SWBT's actual plan.

RE: Service Code, NC, NCI and USOC changes

National standardization of service codes necessitates the change of several combined Loop and Switch Port service code assignments. **If you currently assign your own circuit IDs**, you will need to begin assigning these new codes effective April 29, 2000. The table shown below highlights those ordering combinations that require a change.

Combined Loop and Switch Port	SPEC Code	NC Code	End User NCI	Old Service Code	New Service Code
5.0 db Conditioned Loop with Line Switch Port	UNBCOM	SPSC	02LS2 02GS2	SPFU	**TKXU**
5.0 db Conditioned Loop with Trunk Switch Port	UNBCOM	SPTC	02RV2T	SPFU	**DIXU**
Analog Switch Port + Inter-office Transport + Loop	UNBCOM	SPSC	02LS2 02GS2	SPFU	**FXXU**

Standardization of Common Language Network Channel (NC), Network Channel Interface (NCI) and Service codes have been changed for ADSL. These changes will also be effective 4-29-2000.

Loop Type	SPEC Code	Old NC Code	New NC Code	Old NCI at CLEC Code	New NCI at CLEC Code	NCI at End User	Same Service Code
ADSL capable Loop	UALM13 UALM32	AC--	LX--	02DU200A 02DU900A	02QB9.005 02QB9.0S5	02DU9.005	ACFU

This notification is also to inform you of several changes to the Universal Service Order Codes (USOCs) that you will see on your Customer Service Records. If you are ordering a combined Analog Switch Port and Loop with Interoffice Transport, the cross connect USOCs you will see on your CSR will change from UDLW2 to UCXM2. We had incorrectly populated one of our internal tables.

We have also discovered a problem when we mechanically generate service orders on DS1 Loops with interoffice transport. MOG has been generating the incorrect transport USOC of ULN4S. The correct DS1 transport USOC should be 'ULNHS'.

SWBT Action Item Log

Change Management Process Meeting

As of 02/09/2000

Current Action Items:

Attachment 5

Number	Action Item	Owner	Status	Comments
#3 – 8/10/99	AT&T questioned why CLECs need to provide data on supplemental orders. MCIW stated that the Telecordia report on testing had indicated that SBC had a report available that provides data on supplemental orders. SBC agreed to look into a report and respond back at the next meeting. (Combined issue #5 identified on 7/13 – CLECs to provide 6-months of data for SUP type/scenario at the January, 2000 CMP meeting.)	SBC	Open	11/9 – SBC stated that it has not been able to track down anyone with information on the Telcordia report or a name of a person to contact at Telcordia. AT&T offered to check to see if they have a name of an individual at Telcordia for SBC to contact. 12/7 – SBC will contact Judy Nix from Telcordia. 12/20/99 – Chris contacted Beth Lawson. Telcordia only had test LSRs. 1/11/2000 – Placed call to our contact at Telcordia, pending response. **2/8/2000 – Call in to Bonnie Tai at Telecordia..**
#3 – 10/12/99	SBC will investigate further the difference with regard to LIDB between how Resale and UNE loop are handled.	SBC	Closed 2/8/00	SBC confirmed at the 10/28 conference call that UNE will be handled the same way Resale is handled. 11/9 – It was agreed that this item would be closed after the 11/15 conference call to a review and discuss the LIDB requirements. 12/7 – MCIW will check internally to ensure there are no additional issues with this action item before it is closed. 1/11/2000 – MCIW requested that this item be left open until the 1/15/2000 release is implemented. **2/8/200 – MCIW agreed to close this item.**
#5 – 10/12/99	SBC will check into opening up the LSR OBF fields that it currently does not use.	SBC	Closed 2/8/00	SBC stated that it plans to open up the fields necessary to treat UNE the same as Resale. 11/9 – It was agreed that this item would be closed after review of the requirements. 12/7 – MCIW will check internally to ensure there are no additional issues with this action item before it is

SWBT Action Item Log

Change Management Process Meeting

As of 02/09/2000

Current Action Items:

Attachment 5

Number	Action Item	Owner	Status	Comments
				closed. 1/11/2000 – MCIW requested that this item be left open until further clarification **2/8/2000 – MCIW agreed to close this item.**
#6 – 11/9/99	SBC will investigate what is causing rejects for "C" vs. "P", and if applicable, why change notification did not follow CMP process.	SBC	Closed 2/8/00	1/11/2000 – SBC implemented the matrix from the SOSC, which included a typo. When SOSC published the new matrix, the typo had been corrected. SBC then corrected its error without going through Change Management Process. We should have notified CLECs via CMP, and will do so in the future for these types of changes. **2/8/2000 – CLECs agreed to close this item.**
#1 – 12/7/99	SBC will provide the Initial Requirements via Accessible Letter for the enhancements scheduled for April, for CLEC input on whether to move forward with the enhancements as scheduled. Added #4-12/7/99 - SBC will provide Requirements for the enhancements pertaining to Address Validation on Conversion by the first of January.	SBC	Pending	1/11/2000 – A letter should go out next week. 1/31/2000 CLECSS00-8. **2/8/2000 – Accessible Letter CLECSS00-008 distributed on January 26, 2000. Will leave item open until after the 2/24 meeting.**
#2 – 12/7/99	SBC will investigate the possibility of improving the target date for delivery of LIDB Phase II.	SBC	Closed 2/8/00	1/11/2000 – SWBT is unable to move up the LIDB Phase 2 release no earlier than December. 1/11/2000 – SBC is still pursuing possibility of moving up date for release. **2/8/2000 - LIDB II implementation can not be moved up.**
#3 – 12/7/99	SBC will provide additional information on the RPON process via Accessible Letter, and if requested by the CLECs, schedule a conference call to discuss the information.	SBC	Pending	1/11/2000 – The RPON enhancement has been delayed until the April release. Details will be provided (refer to CLECSS99-173 distributed 12/23/99). **2/8/2000 – CLECSS99-173 edits were rescinded. RPON enhancements have been delayed indefinitely. When rescheduled SBC will put on the 12-Month Development View.**

SWBT Action Item Log

Change Management Process Meeting

As of 02/09/2000

Current Action Items:

Attachment 5

Number	Action Item	Owner	Status	Comments
#4 – 12/7/99	SBC will provide Requirements for the enhancements pertaining to Address Validation on Conversion by the first of January.	SBC	Closed 2/8/00	1/11/2000 – Requirements for Address Validation should be available next week. 1/31/2000 – Initial Requirements. AL distributed. **2/8/2000 – This action item is closed to action item #1-12/7/99 since this is regarding the same release.**
#6 – 12/7/99	SBC will take the input back to the internal LIDB requirements team that the CLECs would like the trigger to be taken from the C order (on the SOC) and not on the completion of the D order, and let them know that Birch would like to provide input into the development of the requirements.	SBC	Open	1/11/2000 – Issue referred to internal requirements team. 1/11/2000 – CLECS requested that a SME be available for next discussion. **2/8/2000 – SBC will schedule a meeting for Mid February, either on 2/15 or 2/16.**
#8 – 12/7/99	SBC will update the SWBT CMP document with the proposed language on the timeline for issuing the meeting minutes.	SBC	Closed 2/8/00	1/11/2000 – CMP document updated to include proposed language. Revised document to be distributed via Accessible Letter next week. **2/8/2000 – SBC will request to close. Accessible Letter CLEC00-030 was distributed on February 1, 2000. CLECs agreed to close this item.**
#9 - 12/7/99	SBC will take the proposed language change on the timeline for issuing the meeting minutes to the 13-State Drafting team for consideration.	SBC	Open	1/11/2000 – Will be discussed at the Drafting Team meeting on 1/11. **2/8/2000 - Will be discussed at the 2/8 p.m. Drafting Team meeting.**
#1 – 1/11/2000	SBC will investigate concern raised that on a return of a FOC, the format was incorrect on REQTYP J, when testing for the 1/15 release in the 2-State region. SBC will check to see if this has occurred in the 5-state region.	SBC	Closed 2/8/00	**2/8/2000 - SBC investigated this issue and did not find this to be a problem in the 5-State region.**
#2 - 1/11/2000	SBC will schedule a sidebar meeting on EDI requirements and testing improvements for February 3rd in St. Louis, and send out an Accessible Letter providing logistics.	SBC	Closed 2/8/00	**2/8/2000 - EDI requirements meeting cancelled in lieu of Plan of Record. Testing meeting to be rescheduled for mid March. See action item #8 - 2/8/2000**
#3 – 1/11/2000	SBC will find out if an Accessible Letter went out advising of the availability of ordering duplicate (dual/concurrent) service and instructions on how it is to be	SBC	Open	**2/8/2000 – SBC will investigate and add the discussion of the status on the availability of ordering**

SWBT Action Item Log

Change Management Process Meeting

As of 02/09/2000

Current Action Items:

Attachment 5

Number	Action Item	Owner	Status	Comments
	ordered.			**duplicate service to the agenda for the next CMP meeting scheduled for 3/14.**
#4 – 1/11/2000	SBC will find out what Accessible Letter category the OP numbering is and report back its findings to CLECs.	SBC	Open	**2/8/2000 - SBC investigating. Operations is the category showing on the web.**
#5 - 1/11/2000	SBC will investigate the possibility of adding a new search category for Accessible Letters, to allow CLECs to search on "all" in addition to the existing categories of General and OSS.	SBC	Open	**2/8/2000 - SBC investigating.**
#6 - 1/11/2000	SBC will investigate the possibility of categorizing the SWA Accessible Letters by state/region, like the General and OSS categories.	SBC	Open	**2/8/2000 - SBC investigating.**
#7 – 1/11/2000	SBC will arrange to have LIDB SMEs attend the next scheduled CMP meeting on February 8th to provide an update and clarification on whether the LIDB update is made with the completion of the "C" or "D" order.	SBC	Pending	**2/8/2000 – Pend this action item for the process flow..**
#8 - 1/11/2000	SBC will add a standing agenda item to CMP meetings for CLEC comments on sidebar meeting minutes.	SBC	Closed 2/8/00	**2/8/2000 SBC has added to agenda.**
#1 – 2/8/2000	SBC will finalize logistics for the sidebar meeting to get input on the business requirements for LIDB Phase II, and send out the information via an Accessible Letter	SBC	Open	
#2 - 2/8/2000	SBC will provide a draft of the requirements for line-sharing via Accessible Letter on 2/14.	SBC	Open	
#3 - 2/8/2000	SBC will conduct a walk-through of the 4/29 Initial Requirements in conjunction with the next CLEC User Forum scheduled for 2/24 from 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM CST in Dallas.	SBC	Open	
#4 - 2/8/2000	SBC will check into the possibility of running a test through to the billing cycle.	SBC	Open	
#5 - 2/8/2000	SBC will provide a draft of the LIDB process flow via Accessible Letter prior to the 2/24 meeting.	SBC	Open	
#6 - 2/8/2000	SBC on will review testing plans for LIDB and get CLEC input at a LIDB meeting scheduled for March.	SBC	Open	

SWBT Action Item Log

Change Management Process Meeting

As of 02/09/2000

Current Action Items:

Attachment 5

Number	Action Item	Owner	Status	Comments
#7 - 2/8/2000	SBC will add the discussion of LIDB testing to the agenda for the next CMP meeting scheduled for 3/14.	SBC	Open	
#8 - 2/8/2000	SBC will provide logistics via Accessible Letter for the rescheduled meeting on testing, which will be held in St. Louis on 3/8 or 3/9.	SBC	Open	
#9 – 2/8/2000	SBC will send information on the service order creation procedure (conversion with new activity) in the 4/29/2000 release via Accessible Letter.	SBC	Open	
#10 – 2/8/2000	SBC will send draft requirements on the 4/29 release via Accessible Letter before the 2/24 meeting.	SBC	Open	
#11 – 2/8/2000	SBC will ensure that the titles of Accessible Letters for expedited/exception requests are clearly noted as such.	SBC	Open	
#12 – 2/8/2000	SBC will add to the agenda for the next CMP meeting, a discussion of the expected target date for providing information on the request to process LSRs on one order.	SBC	Open	
#13 – 2/8/2000	SBC will send out information regarding the NC and NCI code changes via Accessible Letter early next week.	SBC	Open	
#14 – 2/8/2000	SBC will check into the possibility of maintaining and accepting both the old and new NC and NCI codes for a period of time and let the old codes drop off eventually.	SBC	Open	
#15 – 2/8/2000	SBC will check into the RPON delay and provide status information at the next CMP meeting scheduled for 3/14.	SBC	Open	
#16 – 2/8/2000	SBC will communicate the RPON status via Accessible Letter.	SBC	Open	
#17 – 2/8/2000	SBC will see if the meeting on partial migrations can be rescheduled and provide more information to CLECs.	SBC	Open	

SWBT Closed Action Items
Change Management Process Meeting

Closed Action Items:

Attachment 5

Number	Action Item	Owner	Status	Comments
1 – 7/13	CLECs to provide Account Managers by Friday, August 30, 1999 with: • intent to test the October Release • test cases for October Release.		Closed 9/14	
2 – 7/13	SBC to include in the July 28th California CMP meeting agenda a discussion item on the scope of the drafting team. Clarification will then be provided at the August 10th 5-state CMP meeting.		Closed	Clarification to be provided during the 8-10 CMP meeting. SBC provided status from the July 28 California Change Management meeting, where it was agreed that the California agreement would be used as a template for developing a process that will work for the existing 8 states.
3 – 7/13	SBC will investigate a formal documented CMP in SNET and notify drafting team members.		Closed	There is not a formal documented process.
4 – 7/13	SBC will provide status regarding its investigation to expand versioning to include dot releases at the next CMP meeting.		Closed 9/14	Versioning meeting held on 8-9, Accessible Letter to be distributed by August 31st 1999.
6 – 7/13	SBC will prepare a written response to Sprint's Change Request by July 20th. Furthermore, the response will be documented in the Change Request Summary and will be included with these meeting minutes.		Closed	The Feature Availability function is available in both the SWB and PB/NB regions on a feature specific basis. Currently, both SWB and PB/NB provide a validation of one feature at a time, which is how OBF has defined the function in approved Issue 1278. This functionality has been re-defined, however, to provide a list of features by switch and is included in Issue 1671. This issue, however, will not be finalized by OBF in time for SBC to implement in 1999. SBC clarified that the SWB region back-end system cannot utilize NPA/NXX and would require a 10-digit telephone number to be similar, which is not the current industry guideline. To initiate the SWB 10-digit Telephone Number change, SBC will introduce the issue at OBF.
7 – 7/13	A CLEC must notify SBC in writing through its Account Team by August 9th if it wishes to invoke the voting process for the August Release. If such voting is necessary, the vote will be taken at the August 10th CMP meeting and SBC will notify all eligible CLECs of the call for a vote.		Closed	SBC was notified that one CLEC called for a vote.
8 – 7/13	An email notice detailing the call-in number for a CLEC testing readiness call on July 23rd will be sent to CLECs who have confirmed joint testing with SWBT.		Closed	Conference call on 7/23 has been held.

SWBT Closed Action Items

Change Management Process Meeting

Closed Action Items:

Attachment 5

Number	Action Item	Owner	Status	Comments
9 – 7/13	SBC to verify when pre-1999 OSS Accessible Letters will be available on the CLEC Website.		Closed	These Accessible Letters will be on the website in the 4th Quarter
10 – 7/13	Draft meeting minutes to CLECs will be distributed on Friday, July 16th or Monday, July 19th. CLEC comments are due July 23rd with Final Minutes to be issued on July 27th.		Closed	Final Minutes Accessible Letter CLEC99-104.
1 – 8/10	SBC committed to send out an Accessible letter with details on the 2 additional changes for the Oct. 23rd release and request comments. If no protests are received, then the two additional items will be added and a final Accessible Letter will be sent confirming the additions.		Closed 9/14	Accessible LetterCLECSS99-112 announced proposed changes.
2 – 8/10	SBC will provide the decision on versioning by August 31 in an Accessible Letter.		Closed 9/14	
1 – 9/14	SBC will ask its EDI support group to validate that all mapping of the APPTIME field is compliant with National Standards. Any found out-of-compliance will be changed, following the proper change management process.	SBC	Closed 12/7	11/9 – SBC stated that it accepts both military and AM/PM times, which is not in compliance. SBC accepts both to accommodate those CLECs who were not able to convert to military time for the release. 12/06 – Accessible Letter (CLECSS99-162) addressing this issue was distributed on 11/23/99.
2 – 9/14	MCIW, GTECC, and Sprint will find out how they are currently handling indefinite end user service addresses (related to modification SBC presented to Final Requirements for 10/23 Release) and provide feedback via their account managers by 9/15 so that a conference call could be held on 9/17.	CLECs	Closed 9/15	All responded. Issue closed.
1 – 10/12	SBC will send the 8-State CMP document to those participating in the meeting via conference bridge	SBC	Closed 10/22	Distributed CMP document via email on 10/22.
4 – 10/12	SBC will provide conference bridge information and send out more information on LIDB based on today's meeting as well as default mapping documents via Accessible Letter for the special LIDB meeting scheduled for 10/28.	SBC	Closed 10/22	Information provided on 10/22 via Accessible Letter CLEC99-154
6 – 10/12	SBC will send out a list of enhancement projects for the year 2000 by the end of next week.	SBC	Closed 10/29	List of projects distributed with announcement of 7-State Project Prioritization and November CMP meeting.
7 – 10/12	SBC will find out if there is a document/guide listing the location of the items on the new CMP web site.	SBC	Closed 11/9	Accessible Letter CLEC99-141 (distributed 10/14) provided URL and outlined the information contained in the SWBT's CMP web page.
1 – 11/9	SBC will clarify the deadline for filing the final minutes with the TPUC, revise the CMP document as necessary, and advise CLECs.	SBC	Closed 12/7	11/19 – The deadline for filing with the TPUC is two weeks. Revised draft wording is a handout for 12/7 meeting.

SWBT Closed Action Items

Change Management Process Meeting

Closed Action Items:

Attachment 5

Number	Action Item	Owner	Status	Comments
2 – 11/9	SBC will send out an Accessible Letter with the conference bridge information for the 11/15 conference call to discuss the LIDB initial requirements.	SBC	Closed 12/7	Accessible Letter (CLECSS99-155) with the conference bridge information was distributed on 11/15.
3 – 11/9	SBC will follow-up on the status of the requirements for the 3/18/00 DataGate release and respond to AT&T, Excel Communications, and MCIW with expected target date for distribution.	SBC	Closed 12/7	Initial requirements Accessible Letter will be released on 12/17, final requirements Accessible Letter will be released on 1/14/00 , CLECs can begin testing on 2/9/00, with the production release on 3/18/00. Exceptions process will be invoked for this release.
4 – 11/9	CLECs to provide examples of address validation edit/reject orders to SBC by end of next week.	CLEC	Closed 12/7	Birch express mailed examples to SBC. 10 examples received on 11/22.
5 – 11/9	SBC will research the issue of address validation edits/rejects, and discuss its findings/ proposed resolution at first CLEC User Forum.	SBC	Closed 12/7	Closed to CLEC User Forum.
7 – 11/9	SBC will add to the agenda of the first CLEC User Forum, the issue of delays in issuing User ID's and authorizing access to the IS Call Center.	SBC	Closed 12/7	Closed to CLEC User Forum.
8 – 11/9	SBC will add to the agenda of the first CLEC User Forum, the issue of appropriate notification when necessary due to problems with fax machines and redirecting faxed orders.	SBC	Closed 12/7	Closed to CLEC User Forum.

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
CCR 98-001	MCI (SWBT Region)		EDI Pre-Ordering	MCIWorldcom requests SWBT include CSR information and Directory Listing information in the Pre-order capability of EDI in phase I Of SWBT's planned release. These functionalities are critical to MCIWorldcom's successful market launch in the Texas market. MCIWorldcom believes that no other CLECs are considering using these functionalities currently, and will not be impacted by implementing CSR and DL capabilities in phase I of SWBT's Planned release.	EDI/CORBA Pre-Order CSI Targeted for 9/26/99 **9/26/99 - CLOSED**	12/18/98
CCR 98-002	Sprint (SWBT Region)		EDI Pre-Ordering	As we discussed earlier this week, Sprint is requesting an interim solution for receiving the Customer Service Information (CSI) via EDI within the March 99 timeframe. Sprint would like to utilize the Asc X12 Text Message (864) transaction set for the Customer Service Information. A few examples of these transactions are attached. We have also included the format of the query to Southwestern Bell.	EDI/CORBA Pre-Order CSI Targeted for 9/26/99 **9/26/99 - CLOSED**	1/8/99
CCR 99-003	Fort Bend Communications (SWBT Region)	Steve Kidd	Verigate **(SWBT)**	When a manual pre-order is performed on a customer's account, the rates are included along with the USOCs. You do NOT get the rates with an electronic pre-order. I want the some information I receive with a manual pre-order on the electronic pre-order. This information is critical in the Houston area because you cannot differentiate between the rate groups based on the USOC e.g. The charge for a 1FW is $8.15 in rate group 1 or $11.05 in rate group 8. On the electronic pre-order, all that is shown is the 1FW.	2/8/00 SBC will request to close. Rate group information will be provided in the SWBT region in the Datagate, Verigate, EDI/Corba.	3/4/99
CCR 99-004	NTS Communications (SWBT Region)	Veronica Martinez	LEX **(SWBT)**	NTS Communications Inc. requests that the SOC screen needs to identify the End User's Name. Order's being printed are very difficult to match up the SOC's pages to the appropriate LEX'd orders. Having the End User's name recaptured on the SOC screen, or having a Field in which NTS could type the End User's name, would all be extremely helpful. Having all of the vital information on the final SOC page will be beneficial to all CLEC's.	2/8/00 SBC will request to close. Action item should be submitted to the OBF.	3/11/99

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
CCR 99-005	Allegiance Telecom	Steve Taff	EDI	The Local Service Confirmation (LSC) returned via EDI on a 855/865 does not include the CKR AND the ECCKT for Loop Service or Loop Service/ Number Portability orders. This information should be returned for all confirmations as defined in the TCIF EDI Guidelines, Issue 8. As defined by the current LSOR, the assignment of the ECCKT is an option for the CLEC, therefore, Allegiance does not plan to send the ECCKT. Even if the ECCKT is assigned by SBC, the ECCKT should be returned on the LSC. The CKR and ECCKT are required by Allegiance to complete the provisioning of circuits for customers. Allegiance was prepared to go production on 4/1/99 in EDI, but will not move to production until this confirmation issue is resolved.	Targeted for 8/14 EDI/LSR Release **8/14/99 - CLOSED**	4/8/99
CCR 99-006	Sprint (SWBT)	Lisa Gritt	EDI Pre-Ordering **(SWBT)**	This is a request for the Pre-Order transaction Feature and Service Availability by NPANXX. Currently SWBT does not support this Pre-Order transaction by using NPANXX. This would allow within Pre-Order transaction Feature/Service Availability access to a list of products and services in a switch served by a particular NPANXX. This is provided currently for the Pacific Bell and Sprint would request the same functionality for SWBT. LSOG 3 currently supports by NPANXX.	2/8/00 - SBC will provide by WTN.	6/30/99
CCR 99-007	GTE Communication (Pacific Bell)	Michelle Wallace	EDI Ordering **(Pacific Bell)**	On a Migration as specified type order (ACT=V) , current LOSR rules do not allow for the adding of new lines. This situation creates the need to send an additional order to add an additional line, which in turn creates additional work for both Pacific Bell and the CLEC. As noted in the LSOR a CLEC may disconnect a line on a migration as specified order. If some activities at the line level can be accomplished, why can't most all activities be accomplished? The majority of the industry including SWBT will allow this activity.	Pending Assessment	10/26/99
CCR 99-008	GTE Communication (Pacific Bell)	Michelle Wallace	EDI Ordering **(Pacific Bell)**	REMOTE CALL FORWARD This feature cannot be ordered utilizing LSOG standard forms. The feature can only provisioned via the older "S-type" forms. This creates the need to maintain an additional set of form and processes to provision this specific feature. Currently the only possible option is, submit two orders, one to "migrate as is" this will bring the desired feature. And then a second	Pending Assessment	10/26/99

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
				order must be generate to make any needed changes after the migration. For a new connect order you cannot provision this feature without using the "S-type" forms.		
CCR 99-009	GTE Communication (Pacific Bell)	Michelle Wallace	EDI Ordering **(Pacific Bell)**	Current LSOR rules do not allow for some activities at the line level, (ie) add or change features on first line, and disconnect of an existing second line. The majority of the industry including SWBT will allow this type of activity.	Pending Assessment	10/26/99
CCR 99-010	GTE Communication (Pacific Bell)	Michelle Wallace	EDI Ordering **(Pacific Bell)**	The current process to combine or consolidate an EU account when migrating it to a CLEC in the resale environment is extremely difficult and time consuming, and does not reflect an equal level of parity from ILEC to CLEC.	Pending Assessment	10/26/99
CCR 99-011A	Northpoint (Pacific Bell)	Jessica Lewandowski	POS Ordering **(Pacific Bell)**	1) NorthPoint is requesting a change to the length of time that order status remains visible in POS. At this time order status is only visible a few days after the order is completed. If there is provisioning trouble on the line shortly after PB has closed the SORD order, very often is too late for NPC to get access to the information that was available in POS. NPC would like the ability to view the order status for at least 6 months after the SOR orders is completed.	This action item requires more research and will continue to be investigated.	12/1/99
CCR 99-011B	Northpoint (Pacific Bell)	Jessica Lewandowski	POS Ordering **(Pacific Bell)**	2) In conjunction with the change above, NPC would also like the ability to copy order status information from POS. This would enable NPC to retain accurate records in case of provisioning trouble/maint. Issues. The tab with the binding post information is particularly valuable.	POS has scheduled for implementation in July, 2000 the capability to copy, save as and export.	12/1/99
CCR 99-012	MCI WorldCom (Nevada Bell & Pacific Bell)	Rebecca Oliver	Verigate & Datagate Pre-Ordering **(Nevada Bell**	MCIW requests a change in Pacific Bell's Customer Service Record (CSR) as available through VeriGate and DataGate. Request that the customer's complete address—including street number, street name, city name, state name, and zip code--be displayed as a part of the CSR	2/8/00 - SBC can not implement the CCR as	12/9/99

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
			& Pacific Bell)	for resale customers in the exact format that is required by Pacific Bell's back-end ordering systems which process Local Service Requests (LSRs). Specifically, MCIW requests that the "Working Address" section in the Pacific Bell CSR be enhanced by providing the full address for Pacific Bell's resale customers. Presently the "Working Address" section lists the address for resale customers in an abbreviated manner, such as: "1234 Main, ESC" (where ESC is an abbreviation for the city name, and the state name and zip code is not provided). MCIW requests that the address for resale customers be displayed in Pacific Bell's CSR as it is in the "SERVICE ADDR" section in SWBT's CSR, such as: "1234 Main, West Lake Hills, TX/DZIP 78746". This CCR is being submitted as a High Priority because address information is a critical Pre-Ordering requirement. Without complete address information, MCIW is immediately disadvantaged in Pre-Ordering by being forced to manually call the ISCC to obtain the full address. Requiring MCIW to manually verify the customer's address with Pacific Bell's ISCC, every time an order is submitted, is unacceptable. The unavailability of the resale customer's address through VeriGate and DataGate shows that Pacific Bell's proprietary Pre-Ordering systems do not fully support Pre-Ordering. Further, the absence of address information in the SBC CSR is not consistent across the SBC 7-state region. SWBT's CSR does supply the complete address for the resale customer. Pacific Bell's CSR is incomplete by not providing the full working address for resale customers, and must be rectified as soon as possible.	requested due to time and costs concerns, however, SBC proposes a 2-stage solution which provides parity between CLECs and SBC retail service reps. Interim Solution: An electronic copy of the SAGA/Community Name List will be provided to CLECs. This list cross-references community abbreviations, Community names, and SAGA(street address guide area) names and is sorted by community abbreviation. This community Name/SAGA list will be included in the Address	

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
					Validation section of the Verigate User Guide for the March 18th 2000 release and will be available via the CLEC website on February 18, 2000. SAGA can be input in place of zip code in an Address Validation. The first page of this list includes the 7 compressed communities in Pacific Bell. Each community has a primary NPA (area code) associated with it. Using a CSR to do Address Verification, the user would not have to go to the Community Name/SAGA List. Mechanized solution	

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
					(Targeted for July 22, 2000.) SBC will provide a Mechanized SAGA look-up in EDI, Verigate and Datagate. In Verigate, when viewing a CSR, the user would have access to a new GUI button on the Verigate Toolbar where the user would input the Community Abbreviation that is listed on the Working Address of the CSR to retrieve the SAGA. By retrieving this SAGA in addition to using the Working Address on the CSR, the CLEC user would then have the mechanized SAGA lookup.	

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
					If the Community abbreviation is not listed in the Working Address section, this would be another clue to the CLEC User that the Area Code is one of the Suppressed Communities. The Suppressed Community List and their associated Area Codes will be listed on the Mechanized SAGA lookup screen as a guide to the user.	
CCR 99-013	Semi-Private/Proprietary (SWBT)		LEX / EDI Ordering **(Nevada Bell, Pacific Bell & SWBT)**	Currently, when a CLEC issues an LSR to migrate a line from SWBT Retail to the UNE platform, SWBT creates three separate internal orders – a New, Change and Disconnect order. CLEC customers have experienced service outages due to the creation and manipulation of these 3 orders. Manual intervention by SWBT may be necessary when creating and processing these 3 orders through SWBT's back end systems. The D, N and C may be worked at different times causing the customer to lose dial tone. Additionally, the out-of -sync condition among the D,N,C can significantly increase time for order posting. Therefore, a true conversion order must be created. This new transaction type would be used for converting	2/8/2000 - SBC will communicate with the CLEC who submitted the CR that SBC is asking to close. Referred to the CLEC User	11/1/99

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
				UNE-P and Resale customers. Not only would this change result in simplified processing for SWBT (requiring less manual intervention and processing fewer orders) but this would help to minimize impacts to CLEC end user customers.	Forum (SWBT)	
CCR 00-001 CCR 00-001 (continued)	MCI WorldCom (SWBT)	Terri McMillon	EDI Ordering **(SWBT)**	CHANGE REQUEST TO ELIMINATE THE NEED FOR THE CLEC TO SEND ADDRESS INFORMATION ON A LSR FOR AN UNBUNDLED ORDER WHERE THE CUSTOMER IS MIGRATING TO THE CLEC AND THE ADDRESS INFORMATION FOR THE CUSTOMER IS NOT CHANGING. VALIDATION WOULD BE PERFORMED ON THE TELEPHONE NUMBER (TN) WITH THE ADDRESS FIELD/S BEING SENT BLANK UNLESS THE ADDRESS INFORMATION IS CHANGED AT THE TIME OF MIGRATION. THIS CHANGE WOULD ELIMINATE MANY OF THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH ADDRESS VALIDATION ERRORS THAT RESULT FROM KEYING ERRORS BY CLEC INPUT ON THE LSR OR BY SBC PERSONNEL POPULATING DATABASE INFORMATION WITH KEYING ERRORS. THIS WOULD ALSO HELP TO ELIMINATE MANY OF THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH ADDRESS VALIDATION IN DOWNSTREAM SYSTEMS THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION OUTLINES THE CORRESPONDING FIELDS ON THE LSR: The fields used for Service address are on the End User Form in the End User Location section. They include the following: SAPR - Service Address House Prefix (Not used by SWBT) SANO - Service Address House Number SASF - Service Address House Number Suffix SASD - Service Address Street Directional SASN - Service Address Street Name SATH - Service Address Thoroughfare SASS - Service Address Street Suffix FLOOR – Floor	2/8/2000 – Pending Assessment	1/6/00

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
				ROOM - Room BLDG - Building CITY - City STATE – State ZIP - Zip Code These same fields excluding Floor, Room and Building, are used in the Listed Address section of the DL form, but are prefixed with an "L", rather than an "S" - e.g. SAPR becomes LAPR, etc. The Floor, Room and Building info, is placed in the LALO field if the customer wants to include this info in their listing. In addition, the City field becomes the LALOC – Listed Address Locality field on the DL form.		
CCR 00-002 CCR 00-002 (continued)	AT&T (Pacific Bell)	Pam Protheroe	LEX / EDI / Listings Ordering **(Nevada Bell, Pacific Bell & SWBT)**	**Detailed Description of Requested Change:** It is SBC's plan is to move to LSOG4 from LSOG2+ at an undetermined date in 2000. As a result, I have requested it to be with your first big release in 2000, which would be approximately the July timeframe. AT&T conducted an internal walk-through of our LSOG4 requirements back in November, 1999. We agreed that DLNUM helps identify which listing is being rejected vs. guesswork or a phone call to the LEC, especially for LECS that don't use ALI. Currently PBell is one of those LECs; except for Resale services. I do see that you have added ALI to your LSOG4 Change Management documentation for the 850/860 records, but didn't identify for which REQTYP and/or if you would return it on an 855/865 record. At our 10/27/99 SBC Change Management Meeting and a separate 12/99 Prioritization conference call, I requested SBC to return DLNUM conditionally on the 855/865 records with your LSOG4 upgrade. Now, after talking with Rich Brauchle, my AT&T requirements writer and our HQs Directory SME last week, I think we should be pushing for ALI to be returned on the 855/865 records also. **PBell's ALI position:**	2/8/2000 – Pending Assessment	1/13/00

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
CCR 00-002 (continued)				This field has gone back and forth a couple of times during 1999 and your final decision was to "Prohibit" it due to the complexities of your Listings Gateway and your history of assigning the ALI code. The ALI code is NOT unique to the listing, but is unique to the TN. An ALI code of 'A1' is assigned to the Main Listing on every TN, 'A2' etc., for each additional listing for that TN. It is my understanding that generally ALI is controlled by the CLEC. This would present a problem on migration orders. We would have an embedded database to deal with for PBell and these ALI codes currently don't reside in any of our databases. They may reside in PBell's Listings Gateway, once implemented, and we could check there??? **SWBT's ALI position:** SWBT expects to see an ALI assigned by AT&T and within an account, it is unique to the LISTING, not the TN. **Problem:** With LSOG4 SBC intends to use both DLNUM & ALI on the 850/860 records. You currently don't return them on a reject (855/865 record). OBF has defined DLNUM and ALI within both the Directory Completion Practice LSR-109 and the Directory Error Detail Practice LSR-110. This exists in both LSOG3 and LSOG4. **AT&T's Understanding and Desire:** OBF already provides for DLNUM & ALI to be returned on the 855/865 record rejects. AT&T needs this information to analyze a directory related reject without making phone calls to the F-LSC which slows down the order process. This isn't an efficient way to manage orders. An error notification transaction does not include the TN, only the Line Reference [REFNUM/DLNUM] which is unique by line and Error/Error message. ALI code could not replace the REFNUM/DLNUM in uniquely identifying the line on which the error was found; therefore, **we need both the ALI and DLNUM for all REQTYPs that contain Directory Listings**. The "timeliness of		

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
				delivery" is an issue and if it could be available in EDI in advance of being available in LEX, that would be fine with me.		
CCR 00-003 CCR 00-003 (continued)	AT&T (Pacific Bell)	Pam Protheroe	LEX / EDI / Listings Ordering **(Nevada Bell & Pacific Bell)**	Description of Requested Change: When a CLEC wants to do business statewide in California, PBell sets up 2 BAN's for each of our OCN's and Product types (i.e., Loops, UNE Loop with Port, etc). The only exception is for listings, where the system thinks all listings are in the North. You can not do that with the other services, because there is actual installation that must take place, either north or south. One of our acquisitions chose to keep their OCN's isolated by North and South. In fact, you may have built Northern BANS for the Southern CA OCN's and Southern BANS for the Northern CA OCN – but I don't think we use them. PBell's BAN1 (& BAN2 as required) position: This field is REQUIRED for REQTYP = A/B/F/M; Conditional for REQTYP = C/E. For REQTYP = E, the Condition is that it is Optional and will be ignored if provided. BAN isn't required on REQTYP = JB because PBell has an internal table built to assign the BAN based on the OCN. SWBT's BAN1 (& BAN2 as required) position: SWBT reflects BAN as an Optional field for REQTYP = A/B/C/E/F/M. If it is provided, it must be valid. AT&T has chosen not to send it on our orders and SWBT returns the default account number contained in the CLEC profile on file at the LSC. Problem: The PBell LSOR has always stated that BAN is required for the above mentioned REQTYP. PBell has two billing centers driving the North/South BAN assignments for each OCN AT&T maintains. We don't have a problem populating a single BAN on the required orders; however, your internal requirement forces the CLEC's to establish and maintain an NPA-NXX or CLLI Code table. This table becomes a User Managed Table, assigning every NPA-NXX or CLLI Code to one of the BAN/OCN combinations, so that our orders can	2/8/00 – Pending Assessment.	1/13/00

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
CCR 00-003 (continued)				automatically be assigned a BAN to the applicable REQTYP order. We are still trying to develop this table for one of our product lines, and the most difficult will be for our new acquisition company where they have two OCN's in Southern California. PBell's Options: 1. Change to 1 BAN statewide 2. Make BAN1 (& BAN2) Optional and return it on the FOC AT&T's Understanding and Desire: Option #1 may not be a consideration due to your two billing centers. Option #2 is probably the most feasible option and already agrees with your SWBT LSOR. We originally presented this request at the 10/27/99 Change Management Meeting in San Francisco and we haven't received an official PBell response as of this date. Therefore, I am putting this request into a more formal CLEC Change Request form. Our desire is to have Option #2 implemented as soon as possible in order to eliminate our need to complete development of a User Managed Table and no later than your first big release of 2000, or 6-7/2000, whichever comes first. Sooner would be better!		
CCR 00-004	MCI WorldCom (SWBT)	Terri McMillon	LEX, EDI **(Nevada Bell, Pacific Bell & SWBT)** Business Rules as written in 9.5 Related Orders of User Handbook	This request is for the RPON field, Field 44 on the LSR (listed in Section 6 of the LSOR) to be used on all orders, both Mogible and Non-Mogible to relate connect and disconnect service requests or multiple requests for the same location and due date. The relationship should be maintained through ordering, into the SBC back end systems and through the provisioning process. In addition, in the case of an error condition on one or more purchase order numbers, the request is that SBC will develop a business rule whereby the purchase orders that DO NOT receive a reject condition	Pending Assessment	1/28/00

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
			LSOR Section 6, LSR Field 44, 1/15/00 Version	are held for a period of not less than 24 calendar hours to allow the CLEC ordering the service to correct the error through supplemental orders. After the 24 hours timeframe, if the order is not corrected, then the purchase order that is correct that is being held will be rejected back to the sending CLEC as a reject with "Related Order Not Found."		
CCR 00-005	MCI WorldCom (SWBT)	Terri McMillon	Verigate, CEASE, BEASE, LEX, POS, SORD, Order Status, & Trouble Admin **(Nevada Bell, Pacific Bell & SWBT)**	This request is for SBC to officially support the Windows 98 operating system in addition to current operating systems supported for the Toolbar application (Windows 95 and Windows NT 4.0) and all applications accessed through the Toolbar software. Windows 98 is a proven operating system that is widely deployed in the business community and on user desk tops. The current Toolbar application is not completely compatible with the Windows 98 operating system and may, therefore, cause problems when a user attempts to access the SBC OSS using the Toolbar application. When MCI WorldCom has questioned this in past Change Management Meetings, the response was that the feasibility was being looked at and it was hinted that there might be development under way. This is a critical functionality to insure that all users have access to the Toolbar applications and MCI WorldCom feels this upgrade should be implemented immediately.	Pending Assessment	1/28/00
CCR 00-006	MCI WorldCom (SWBT)	Terri McMillon	LEX & EDI **(Nevada Bell, Pacific Bell & SWBT)** Section 9 Port Service (PS) Field #39 Block	Accessible Letter CLECSS99-176 was issued to advise that SWBT will not support the BLOCK field value of "N" for Block Casual Calling. Instead, the CLEC must send a FID value of /PROX in the FEATURE DETAIL field for the FEATURE "ZUNEL", in order to provision the Block for Casual Calling. MCI WorldCom requests that the value of "N" in the BLOCK field be used by SWBT rather than sending the FEATURE DETAIL to be included with the PHASE II LIDB release. The use of the "N" value in the BLOCK field is allowed for in industry guidelines and MCI	2/8/2000 - Pending Assessment	1/28/00

January 2000
(Revised 2/3/00)

CCR Tracking Number	Originating CLEC (Region)	CLEC Primary Contact Name	Interface Affecting	Verbatim Description	Status	Date Received
				WorldCom urges SBC to implement this value as a valid value to Block Casual Calling by using the BLOCK field, #39 in Port Service.		

02/03/00