



**JOINT SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY  
DECLARATION OF  
TERRI MCMILLON, JOHN SIVORI,  
AND SHERRY LICHTENBERG**

**EXHIBIT 6**

# Accessible



**“Final Minutes for October 28, 1999 Change Management Process Sidebar Conference Call on Special LIDB Release - Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas”**

Date: November 22, 1999

Number: CLEC99-174

Contact: Southwestern Bell Account Manager

This Accessible Letter serves to distribute the Final Minutes of the October 28, 1999 Change Management Process sidebar conference call on the special LIDB release. Draft minutes were distributed to participants for comment. Comments received were incorporated into the Final Minutes.

Please direct any questions to your Account Manager.

Attachment

**SWBT Change Management Process - Sidebar  
Conference Call on Special LIDB Release  
Thursday, October 28 1999 ~ 9:00am – Noon  
FINAL MINUTES**

**A conference call was held today with the following participants:**

AT&T	MCIW
Birch	Optel
Great West Service	Sprint
KMC	SBC

**SBC discussed the requirements document. Highlights from the discussion are summarized below.**

- MCIW asked what was different from the Resale process with this option. SBC answered that the process is exactly the same. Furthermore, SBC will handle the changes based on information provided from the CLEC to us. Subsequent changes would be sent via FAX.

**Form from CLEC**

Section 1: ID

Section 2: On-going

Section 3: Conversion

Section 4: New connects

- MCIW and Birch asked why a separate form for changes was required and the LSR was not being used. SBC asked what scenario was in question. MCIW responded blocking change. SBC explained the interim process goes directly to the Database Administration Center (DBAC), not the LSC.
- Optel asked if changes are required. SBC answered "no."
- MCIW asked if the DACC field was opened. SBC responded "no."
- MCIW again asked why the manual input couldn't be taken from the provisioning LSR. SBC responded the data layout is in the format the DBAC clerk is used to seeing.
- SBC discussed the ballot form, explaining that conversion and new connect activity could be handled via the LSR while ongoing administration could continue to be done via the unbundled interfaces. SBC further explained this election could be changed. So, a customer could use the LSR process for conversion and the unbundled interface for ongoing administration between Phase 1 and 2. At the implementation of Phase 2, the customer could change the election to use the LSR process for all activity. A conversion of the existing database for that customer would have to be coordinated to use the LSR for all ongoing activity.
- MCIW asked if CLECs could get requirements modified, as the documentation is confusing and contradictory. SBC agreed to do this.
- A question was raised regarding the process for updating LIDB and what happens if the LSR is rejected. SBC answered that information is distributed by service order only after an LSR is accepted and LIDB is updated on completion of the service order.

- It was asked if CLECs could test functionality including LIDB updates. SBC responded yes, during the period of 12/15 through 1/15/2000.
- An explanation was requested of when LIDB is updated. SBC responded that for Retail, Resale and UNE-P, some data are populated on completion of the service order, and the remaining data when the service order is posted to the billing system.
- A question was asked to verify if an order errors, when a CLEC can access the record in LIDB. SBC answered that within 24 hours, as the record transfers on the completion pass of the service order for transfer as-is and it does not matter if the order does not post to the billing system due to an error. SBC was not sure of transfer with change.  
**UPDATE:** The change would not be reflected until the order post – this is if the change has to do with the listed name or listed address or blocking.
- A question was raised if transfer as-is was selected, would the credit card information be deleted. SBC responded “no.”
- AT&T said its contract states delete the credit card, and asked if they have to use with Conversion with Change. SBC answered “yes”, and informed the CLECs that this issue was brought up with the Commission. SBC can only transfer all information. To delete the credit card requires Conversion with Changes.
- SBC was asked to clarify how the “delete” Option would work. Can the CLEC still clear the record and start over with unbundled LVAS. SBC replied “yes.”
- SBC was asked to clarify whether options in Attachment 2, Section 2, would pertain to the border areas of Missouri, where SWBT does not own the switches. SBC stated there should be no problem, and agreement was reached on the revised wording for the form.
- MCIW asked what exactly was in Phase 1 and how specifically to handle a conversion plus adding a line. SBC responded that it should be handled as a conversion with changes. SBC explained that the directory disposition triggers this. A file guide order is created and drives LIDB. Further, Phase 1 is ACTTYP V and N only. Adding a line on a subsequent Change activity is not in Phase 1.
- A question was raised as to whether account activity of D is at the line level and whether an LSR for LIDB update in can be sent in Phase 1. SBC answered N and V ACTTYPs are at account level and SBC will clarify the documentation.  
**UPDATE:** Activity of D will not be accepted for LIDB changes or deletion in Phase I.
- A question was raised regarding changing a TN. SBC answered that the process is the same; N and V account activity is okay in Phase 1 and the TN can be changed at that time. Change activity is in Phase 2.
- Another question was raised regarding whether SBC would remove the record on the old TN for ACT V and Change TN. SBC responded “yes.”
- MCIW asked to reconfirm that on-going administration could be done through LVAS. SBC said “yes.” SBC will also clarify and re-issue the documentation.  
**UPDATE:** SBC distributed initial requirements via Accessible Letter CLECSS99-152 on November 8, 1999.

- A question was asked about PIC changes. SBC explained that Phase 1 requires FAX or LVAS update. SBC explained the use of PIC in LIDB is for secondary IXC selection on 0 – calls.
- Option 1 and 2 for Phase 2 were discussed. Choice was option 2, CLEC provides only what is changing; “the Cadillac”.
- A question was asked why an outside move could not be part of Phase 1. SBC will look at this.  
**UPDATE:** SBC agreed to work on N and V. The DBAC does not have the resources to program other activities until Phase II.
- A question was asked if Attachment 5 applies to Phase 1 and 2. SBC stated there is an error and will reissue the document.
- A comment was made asking SBC to consider providing a process flow diagram to display LSR activity process, including SUPPs and Cancels. SBC agreed to consider this.
- SBC was asked to explain the CRIS audit referenced in Attachment 1. SBC stated that update is necessary to ensure integrity.
- It was stated that the CRIS audit made it possible for a record to be changed in a way that was not what the CLEC wanted. SBC stated that this situation should not happen unless an emergency update is done by the CLEC and an LSR to confirm the change is not issued.
- A question was raised about the security of the CRIS record. SBC insured CLECs that SBC Retail cannot see the CRIS record.
- SBC was asked to consider providing an error feed (e.g., errors processed through LASR GUI), should there be a need. SBC will look at this request.
- SBC was asked to consider incorporating D activity in Phase 1. SBC agreed to consider doing this.  
**UPDATE:** SBC determined that it is not possible to incorporate D activity since it is only programming DBAC to accept N and V activity type, which is really “N”, File Guide request.

**SBC recapped the dates for Phase 1:**

- Testing begins December 15<sup>th</sup>
- Deployment January 15<sup>th</sup> and
- Live on January 17<sup>th</sup>.

**Dates for Phase 2 will be determined in the November 9<sup>th</sup> priority discussion.**

**SBC thanked everyone for participating and the conference call concluded.**



**JOINT SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY  
DECLARATION OF  
TERRI MCMILLON, JOHN SIVORI,  
AND SHERRY LICHTENBERG**

**EXHIBIT 7**

May 3, 2000  
 LVAS Users' Group Meeting

Attendees

In person			
Wanda Baker	Adelphia	Maggie Turner	Adelphia
Bob Royer	SWBT	George Ashmore	SBC
Sheryl Scobel	Stratos	David Rose	Stratos
Leslee Engleman	MCIW	Roseann Kendall	MCIW
Archie Croom	PNSI	Merrie Bennett	Birch Telecom
Stacy Hassan	Birch Telecom	Paul Pinick	Birch Telecom
Chuck Williams	SWBT	Mel Wagner Jr.	Birch Telecom
On Phone:			
Juleen Dailey	SWBT	Lisa Rothe	SWBT

Accepted minutes from last meeting.

The groups agreed to approve the minutes as the minutes were developed in the meeting.

LSR Process

Dave Clippard provided an overview of Phase II development. This development focuses mainly on programming changes in service order processing and CRIS File Guide formatting. Once Phase II is in place, accounts created in that environment will be included in the Source Audit process. This process compares LVAS records against CRIS records. If it encounters a discrepancy the LVAS record is replaced with the CRIS record. The exception to this is data associated with Calling Card PIN information. This information isn't changed through the audit process.

Accounts created prior to Phase II are exempt from the Source Audit Process. This is because the CRIS File Guide doesn't contain a complete record of the account. To bring those accounts into the Source Audit Process, the CRIS File Guide must be brought current. There are two methods to accomplish this. The first method is for the CLEC to re-issue an LSR for each of its accounts. SWBT is exploring a second method tentatively called the "Reverse Audit". This process would take the LVAS record and populate information in the CRIS File Guide to match the LVAS record. Product management doesn't yet have confirmation of the creation of this process but is pursuing. This reverse audit process cannot occur prior to Phase II and might not be ready until after Phase II is implemented. Regardless of its implementation there must be a conversion process to bring pre-Phase II records into the Phase II environment. For many companies this will involve the re-partitioning of their records.

Roseann Kendall asked what would happen to a record created before Phase II that is still partitioned to the CLEC and an update is sent over the LSR. What would happen to the CRIS File Guide. Dave did not know and agreed to research.

Leslie Engleman asked if an LSR is sent but the information gets hung up in the service order process and doesn't reach CRIS? If the information doesn't post to CRIS, the

information will not flow down to LVAS and the LVAS record will either not exist or not be updated to match the service order (depending on the order type).

Leslie Engleman asked what if the information gets to CRIS but not to LVAS? Lisa Rothe said that this couldn't happen.

Paul Pinick asked about the association with the SOC and the LVAS update. Dave Clippard explained that there isn't a direct relationship between the two. The SOC notifies the CLEC that provisioning has completed. If there are no errors in the service order, the service order information should then begin to flow to downstream systems and post to CRIS. LVAS will then receive its update and process it within 24 hours of the SOC issuance. If there is an error in the service order that prohibits the information from being distributed to LVAS, then the update will not occur.

Dave Clippard asked if the service order errors, does the CLEC know it? Paul and Roseann said no. Maggie Turner later in the meeting addressed Order Stat via Toolbar contained this information. However, this information doesn't return automatically through the LSR platform. If the order errors out prior to the SOC, the CLEC will receive an error notification. This doesn't occur after the SOC is issued. Archie Croom noted that it would be helpful to get a posted report added to the list of FOC and SOC reports. That way CLECs don't have to get involved in the detail of why it didn't post, just that it didn't. Chuck Williams agreed to take this issue back to Change Management.

Roseann Kendall stated that MCIW had requested a walkthrough of the information flow through to LVAS in the Change Management Process. Chuck Williams stated that the goal is to supply the Phase II requirements and a walkthrough of the information flow before the end of May. Mel Wagner and Paul Pinick noted that the agenda for the next Change Management Meeting contains a "Review of SWBT Flow-Through Matrix". Paul Pinick stated that Gerri Orr was working to put that matrix together. Chuck Williams noted that the MCIW account team is working on getting an answer to these questions.

Leslie Engleman asked what is happening to a service order that goes into error status, what is wrong with the order, and why aren't CLECs being notified of the problem? Juleen Dailey stated that we need input from the LSC to explain what happens to a service order in error status. Dave Clippard noted that an error status order does not distribute and without distribution LVAS doesn't get information to create a record or update a record.

The group agrees that these issues surrounding service order errors need to be addressed in the Change Management Process. Dave Clippard also agreed to raise these issues internally, however Dave also pointed out that Account Management's support would raise the issue quicker.

Maggie Turner stated that Adelphia looks at the posted and pending reports on a daily basis. These reports exist on Order Stat via Toolbar. These reports list the status of

service orders, including pending, posted, and error status. CLECs can use these for a variety of purposes including a guide to work with the LSC to get issues resolved. Paul Pinick of Birch indicated that his company also uses these reports.

Paul Pinick stated that the LSC can pull order stat reports to see Birch orders that are outstanding and that have completed but not posted. Birch had to give the LSC authorization to pull those orders

Leslee Engleman asked how does partitioning happen? Dave Clippard noted all records in LIDB have to belong to a data administering company. When an end user changes service providers, if the new service provider is a different data administrator, the record must change security before the new data administrator can access the record with an update. This conversion of record security occurs in LVAS. It is possible for a record to change local service providers but not data administrators. When that occurs, the record doesn't need to be re-partitioned.

Chuck Williams asked if XYZ owns a record and ABC issues an LSR to convert the end user, what will happen to the record? Dave noted that if ABC issues an LSR, XYZ has no say in whether the record will transfer. If ABC issues an order in error, and the order isn't canceled prior to posting, security partitioning and ownership will transfer to ABC. Then ABC must help in getting that record back to XYZ

Leslee Engleman and Roseann Kendall asked where in the process might security partitioning get hung up. Dave noted that "hanging up" has to occur prior to posting. Posting finalizes the data to the CRIS database and triggers the downstream flow of data to LVAS. The Billing Validation Distribution System (BVDS) receives the data from the OSS and translates the data into a format that LVAS can understand. One should think of BVDS as a translator. It is similar to the process a CLEC would have in its systems if the CLEC is using the Service Order Entry Interface (aka the bulk feed).

Roseann Kendall noted that MCIW is consistently having trouble with PIC information being incorrect on the order up to 72 hours after the conversion. MCIW has selected transfer with changes. Roseann noted that this includes inter and intraLATA CIC.

Lisa Rothe noted that on the records she has reviewed, she is encountering N orders in error status. This appears to be an error that occurs after the SOC issuance because there is no notification back to MCIW of the error status. Dave noted that this problem relates back to the previous issue of post-SOC errors and can be addressed in the issue being taken back to Change Management. Archie Croom noted that this is just a control point and not a solution to the issue. Archie Croom suggested that the solution would be to automatically present error orders to LSC personnel for resolution.

Dave Clippard noted that in Texas today there is no impact of the PIC information. PIC information is returned only on OLNS responses. Today, SWBT is the only OLNS query-originator to LIDB. When an end user picks up the phone and dials 1+, the PIC used is the one translated in the end office switch, not LIDB. When the end user dials

around, it gets the PIC it dialed around to. Only when the end user reaches a SWBT Operator or DA platform is the LIDB information invoked through an OLNS query. (End users reach SWBT's platform by dialing 1411. When an end user dials 1+NPA+555+, the end user reaches an IXC platform and no IXCs currently access LIDB through OLNS.) LIDB returns inter- and intraLATA PIC to SWBT OS and DA platforms but SWBT doesn't use the information in Texas. SWBT does use the Account Owner field to provide branding. In some states, the PIC can be used for Operator Transfer, but not in Texas. In Texas, SWBT uses an allocation list and transfers callers based upon a carrier's presence on that list.

#### Deletion of Abandoned Records

Lisa Rothe noted that deletion of abandoned records would help prevent fraud. Any records that are unclaimed for seven days will be blocked. Fourteen days later, if these records are still unclaimed, they will be deleted. These records are those that transfer "as is" between local providers. With these transfers, there will be an RSI field value of "L" which means "transitional". Transitional means that the new owning company hasn't claimed the record and confirmed the accuracy of the information. Changing the RSI field to "not equal L" means that the record has been claimed and confirmed. This abandoned record project will target records that remain unclaimed after 7 days. At that point fields in LIDB will be blocked. Fourteen days after that, the record will be deleted (this is the 21<sup>st</sup> date.) When a record changes ownership, the date that it changes ownership will be day 0. Seven days after that date is when SWBT will block the billing indicators. That means deactivating calling cards, blocking collect and third number acceptance, and on the OLNS side, blocking the ability to originate calling card, collect, third number billing, DACC and the other OLNS billing values.

Dave Clippard asked if the originating sent paid indicator should also be blocked as of the 7<sup>th</sup> day. This indicator could have an impact to companies that query LIDB for OLNS. Although no companies other than SWBT perform such queries today, there is increasing interest from mass market dial-around providers and potential use for wireless in the calling party pays market. A block on this indicator could help to protect those companies. Leslee Engleman asked if we could make that decision on the next meeting. Dave Clippard agreed.

Archie Croom expressed a concern that unless a CLEC knows when its account has posted, the CLEC can't begin its own timing. Paul Pinick noted that CLEC's using the "transfer as is" process should use receipt of the SOC as their timing mechanism and that none of this is an issue for those CLECs that have selected the "transfer with changes" options. Dave Clippard agreed. SWBT doesn't recommend the "transfer as is" option for several reasons. First, the "transfer with changes" options eliminates the need to claim the record. Second, the CLEC will always be certain of what information is on its LIDB record using the "with changes" option. "Transfer as is" is also not compatible with the Source Audit because the CRIS record for the end user will not be complete and the Source Audit will modify the LVAS record to match the incomplete CRIS record.

Lisa Rothe also noted that we had discussed an enhancement to the Interactive Interface to allow CLECs to identify records in jeopardy of being eliminated. Archie Croom noted that his company would be interested in such a capability on the interface.

#### Ameritech

Paul Pinick requested information regarding Ameritech. Dave Clippard noted that Ameritech has some unique capabilities in its network. Ameritech uses its AIN platform for most of its CNAM queries. By June, Ameritech will use its AIN platform for all CNAM queries. Additionally, Ameritech's end offices do not launch GR-1188-CORE queries. These are the queries that work with LIDB. The Ameritech end offices launch AIN queries. AIN SCPs understand these queries. When Ameritech needs to query a foreign LIDB CNAM database; e.g., Illuminet, SWBT, SNET, etc. Ameritech must re-query or reformat the query into 1188 format. When that query is going against a ported number and an LNP look-up is also added to the equation, the end office times-out before the information can be retrieved. This means that Ameritech is not able to display names associated with ported numbers when those ported numbers reside in a foreign LIDB CNAM database. CLECs that own the ported numbers can still retrieve the associated names if their switches are launching 1188 queries.

Dave also noted that the administrative system in Ameritech will be changed out and replaced with a system cloned from Pacific (i.e., OSMOP). This is scheduled for the August time frame. In addition, the Ameritech LIDB resides on manufacturer discontinued equipment. Current plans are to eliminate the Ameritech LIDB and move the data over to the SNET LIDB. A letter announcing this change will occur this month. The target date for this change is October 2000.

#### Data Screening

SWBT's data screening tariff changes went into effect without opposition. Pacific's mirror filing did not receive comments during the comment period but did receive informal questions from one IXC and FCC staff. In discussions with those parties, SWBT agreed to withdraw the Pacific filing until consensus could be reached between the three parties. SWBT then intends to re-file the Pacific filing and then to amend the SWBT filing to match. SWBT will not offer either data screening or GetData until those filings become effective. Dave Clippard noted that he has requested contract issues or draft contract language from the Users' Group for both Data Screening and GetData but that to-date no one has offered any suggestions.

#### Consolidating Data Storage.

Dave Clippard noted that it is technically possible to store a telephone number in any LIDB in the nation. However, it is not technically feasible to do so. The issue resides with routing. Resale and UNE-P numbers should remain stored with the LIDB used by the incumbent. This is because these numbers don't appear in the LNP database and query routing for these numbers is based on NPANXX. Traffic can only be directed to the database selected by the NPANXX code holder. Ported numbers can be stored anywhere because the LNP database will identify the LIDB network where those numbers reside.

Dave noted that in choosing a LIDB provider for ported numbers, data owners should select a LIDB provider that is connected to a transport network that knows about number portability nationwide. This is necessary to avoid query looping. For example: a number ports out of BellSouth's network and the new service provider wants to store the number in SWBT's LIDB. A query launched in the BellSouth's region against that number would get an LNP look-up and the query would get directed to SWBT's LIDB. SWBT's network, however, doesn't know about portability in the BellSouth region and SWBT would send the query back (because it thinks the data resides with BellSouth). This creates a loop. This will occur even though SWBT stores the data because it is the STP, not LIDB, that controls routing and the STP doesn't have LNP information for BellSouth.



**JOINT SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY  
DECLARATION OF  
TERRI MCMILLON, JOHN SIVORI,  
AND SHERRY LICHTENBERG**

**EXHIBIT 8**

**SWBT TIMESTAMPS FOR  
LATE SOC TICKET #  
3008632 & 3025595**

	PON	VER	ACK		FOC		DUE DATE	JEO		JEO Reason	COMP		LINE TYPE
			DATE	TIME	DATE	TIME		DATE	TIME		DATE	TIME	
1	S000719182SWTXPR	2	18-Apr	12:50	18-Apr	17:10	20-Apr	25-Apr	15:44	Notification new Due date	3-May	7:47	Migration
2	S000719442SWTXPR	2	21-Apr	8:14	21-Apr	10:41	21-Apr	27-Apr	8:07	Verify address or provide nearby TN			Migration
3	S000722235SWTXPR	1	14-Apr	21:32	20-Apr	10:08	20-Apr	25-Apr	16:29	Verify address or provide nearby TN			Migration
4	S000722593SWTXPR	2	17-Apr	15:31	17-Apr	15:31	19-Apr	28-Apr	8:59	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment			Migration
5	S000722812SWTXPR	2	17-Apr	13:31	17-Apr	16:49	19-Apr				26-Apr	19:08	Migration
6	S000722850SWTXPR	2	17-Apr	13:31	17-Apr	17:48	19-Apr	27-Apr	7:50	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment	27-Apr	17:11	Migration
7	S000722864SWTXPR	2	17-Apr	13:31	17-Apr	16:09	19-Apr	2-May	15:04		5-May	19:30	Migration
8	S000722865SWTXPR	2	17-Apr	13:31	18-Apr	13:18	19-Apr	27-Apr	10:18	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment	27-Apr	14:14	Migration
9	S000722868SWTXPR	2	17-Apr	13:31	17-Apr	18:05	19-Apr	27-Apr	7:59	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment			Migration

10	S000722869SWTXPR	2	17-Apr 13:31	18-Apr 12:28	19-Apr	25-Apr 1:51	Notification of New Due Date	29-Apr 11:52	Migration
11	S000722928SWTXPR	2	17-Apr 13:31	19-Apr 12:27	19-Apr			2-May 8:58	Migration
12	S000726258SWTXPR	1	17-Apr 16:23	19-Apr 8:17	19-Apr	27-Apr 8:15	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment	29-Apr 13:01	Migration
13	S000726685SWTXPR	1	17-Apr 17:23	18-Apr 10:43	19-Apr	27-Apr 7:59	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment	28-Apr 19:29	Migration
14	S000727641SWTXPR	1	17-Apr 20:17	20-Apr 11:59	21-Apr			28-Apr 17:21	Migration
15	S000727713SWTXPR	1	17-Apr 20:37	18-Apr 14:08	19-Apr	27-Apr 7:50	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment	2-May 8:58	Migration
16	S000728340SWTXPR	1	18-Apr 8:57	21-Apr 15:07	21-Apr			26-Apr 17:09	Migration
17	S000728399SWTXPR	1	18-Apr 16:39	19-Apr 11:55	20-Apr	25-Apr 15:44	Notification of New Due Date	28-Apr 19:04	Migration
18	S000728409SWTXPR	1	18-Apr 10:08	19-Apr 15:23	20-Apr			29-Apr 12:50	Migration
19	S000728495SWTXPR	1	18-Apr 10:09	21-Apr 16:47	21-Apr			27-Apr 12:45	Migration
20	S000729750SWTXPR	1	18-Apr 20:23	18-Apr 20:31	20-Apr			28-Apr 15:54	Migration
21	S000730904SWTXPR	1	18-Apr 22:41	21-Apr 13:48	21-Apr	28-Apr 16:14	No Access to end User		Migration
22	S000731294SWTXPR	1	18-Apr 23:10	21-Apr 14:22	21-Apr	26-Apr 14:45	Notification of New Due Date	26-Apr 21:02	Migration
23	S000731305SWTXPR	1	18-Apr 23:10	19-Apr 11:40	20-Apr			25-Apr 16:45	Migration
24	S000731328SWTXPR	1	18-Apr 23:10	19-Apr 12:27	20-Apr	25-Apr 13:51	Notification of New Due Date/Please send Supp to Cancel	26-Apr 17:19	Migration
25	S000731941SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 0:11	20-Apr 11:59	21-Apr			26-Apr 16:17	Migration
26	S000731964SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 0:19	19-Apr 14:26	21-Apr			28-Apr 16:14	Migration

27	S000732162SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 0:38	19-Apr 15:55	21-Apr				29-Apr 14:02	Migration
28	S000732163SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 0:38	19-Apr 17:19	21-Apr				26-Apr 16:09	Migration
29	S000732183SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 0:47	19-Apr 17:38	21-Apr				26-Apr 16:23	Migration
30	S000732311SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 1:11	19-Apr 13:57	21-Apr	25-Apr 12:37	Notification of New Due Date		26-Apr 17:19	Migration
31	S000732319SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 1:03	19-Apr 13:26	21-Apr				21-Apr 17:35	Migration
32	S000732645SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 11:54	21-Apr 10:14	21-Apr				28-Apr 15:34	Migration
33	S000733323SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 14:08	19-Apr 14:11	21-Apr	26-Apr 9:26	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment		27-Apr 16:46	Migration
34	S000735029SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 22:37	19-Apr 22:41	21-Apr	27-Apr 8:41	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment			Migration
35	S000735044SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 22:38	20-Apr 13:58	21-Apr	27-Apr 7:59	Notification of New Due Date/Missed Appointment		2-May 8:59	Migration
36	S000735081SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 22:38	20-Apr 11:46	21-Apr	27-Apr 7:59	Invalid Feature Detail/Missed Appointment/Notification of New Due Date		2-May 8:59	Migration
37	S000735096SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 22:38	20-Apr 12:57	21-Apr				26-Apr 16:09	Migration
38	S000735187SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 22:38	20-Apr 13:50	21-Apr	27-Apr 7:59	Missed Appointment/Notification of New Due Date/Invalid Feature Detail			Migration
39	S000735393SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 22:39	19-Apr 22:50	21-Apr				8-May 14:17	Migration

40	S000735807SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 22:40	20-Apr 13:20	21-Apr	25-Apr 15:44	Notification of New Due Date	28-Apr 17:59	Migration
41	S000735856SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 22:40	19-Apr 22:50	21-Apr	26-Apr 10:10	Invalid feature Detail/Notification of New Due Date	28-Apr 17:27	Migration
42	S000735975SWTXPR	1	19-Apr 22:40	20-Apr 16:24	21-Apr			27-Apr 15:10	Migration

NOT LATE