Attachment 1

AT&T's Local Exchange Service Offering in Washington, Utah, Montana and Wyoming

Washington

AT&T provides local exchange service to business and residential customers in Washington. AT&T provides local exchange service to residential customers through its own cable telephone facilities. To support its cable telephony offer for residential customers, AT&T requires local number portability, interconnection and directory listings services from Qwest. AT&T provides local exchange services to small business customers through a combination of its own facilities and UNE-P. AT&T uses its own facilities and unbundled loop, collocation, local number portability, interconnection, and directory listings services from Qwest to provide local exchange services to small business customers. AT&T provides local exchange services to large business customers using its own facilities and local number portability, special access and interconnection services from Qwest.

Utah

AT&T provides local exchange service to business and residential customers in Utah. AT&T provides local exchange service to residential customers through its own cable telephone facilities. To support its cable telephony offer for residential customers, AT&T requires local number portability, interconnection and directory listings services from Qwest. AT&T provides local exchange services to small business customers through its own facilities. AT&T uses its own facilities and unbundled loop, collocation, local number portability, interconnection, and directory listings services from Qwest to provide local exchange services to small business customers. AT&T provides local exchange services to large business customers using its own facilities and local number portability, special access and interconnection services from Qwest.

Montana

AT&T provides local exchange service to business customers in Montana. AT&T provides local exchange services to large business customers using its own facilities and local number portability, special access and interconnection services from Qwest.

Wyoming

AT&T provides local exchange service to business customers in Wyoming. AT&T provides local exchange services to large business customers using its own facilities and local number portability, special access and interconnection services from Qwest.

AT&T's Use of Qwest's Interfaces

Pre-Ordering and Ordering

AT&T places orders the large majority of orders with Qwest using the EDI interface. AT&T is currently certified to EDI version 8.0 with plans to migrate to version 10.0 in late July of 2002. AT&T uses, in limited situations, the IMA-GUI interface as a backup to the EDI interface. AT&T places orders for interconnection trunks and special access services using the ASR interface. AT&T has developed a separate EDI interface for the placement of stand-alone directory listings orders. To support the preparation of LSRs and ASRs, AT&T performs pre-order queries using both the EDI pre-order capabilities as well as the IMA-GUI interface.

Maintenance and Repair

AT&T submits trouble reports to Qwest via telephone calls to the Qwest maintenance and repair center. AT&T does not use either the CEMR or EB-TA maintenance and repair interfaces.

Attachment 2

In light of the investigations currently underway in Minnesota, Arizona, Oregon, New Mexico, Iowa and Utah into Qwest's disclosure of agreements signed with Eschelon Telecom Inc., Covad Communications Inc., and McLeod USA (the three CLECs), KPMG Consulting conducted a review of the Draft Final Report in order to identify specific test sections that contain conclusions that are based, in whole or in part, on representations, information, or data obtained from, or provided by the three CLECs. The following document describes the results of that review.

First, KPMG Consulting makes no assertion as to the accuracy or completeness of the information provided by the three CLECs. Second, KPMG Consulting makes no assertion as to whether or not the information received from the three CLECs is representative of the "typical" CLEC experience, given the preferential treatment the three CLECs may have received from Qwest.

Upon review, the evaluation criteria presented in the Draft Final Report fall into three categories with regard to reliance on information obtained from the three CLECs:

- "No Reliance." -- no CLEC participation was required, or utilized, as a data point for drawing conclusions in the Draft Final Report. This category represents the vast majority of the evaluation criteria contained in the Draft Final Report.

- "Partial Reliance." -- CLEC representations, information or data was used as one data point among many. For example, in evaluating the ISC help desk, KPMG Consulting interviewed several CLECs, monitored HPC's observations and exceptions, interviewed the P-CLEC, conducted on-site inspections of the ISC and reviewed relevant documentation. In these cases, the representations made by any individual CLEC were simply one of several inputs used by KPMG Consulting to draw its conclusions. Attached is a list of evaluation criteria, by number, that qualify for this category.

- "Substantial Reliance." – CLEC representations, information or data was used as the primary data point used by KPMG Consulting in drawing its conclusions. Attached is a list of evaluation criteria, by number, that fall into this category.

In addition, in the attached we describe four other uses of CLEC information during the tests. KPMG Consulting would be happy to discuss this situation, and to provided further information about the potential impact of this disclosure on the test as required.

CLEC Participation
Qwest 271 OSS Evaluation

Test Number	Criterion	Evaluation Criteria	Comments
12	12-11-2	Product and feature offerings are comparable for both retail and wholesale services.	KPMG Consulting considered CLEC input in the evaluation of this criterion. However, CLEC comments were not the only source for data. Documentation reviews, Qwest interviews, Qwest observations and CLEC observations were also considered in the evaluation.
12	12-11-3	Pre–Order and Order capabilities are functionally equivalent for both retail and wholesale services.	same as 12-11-2
12.7	12.7-1-1	The end-user information that is required prior to the submission of a loop qualification is the same for wholesale and retail orders.	KPMG Consulting considered CLEC input in the evaluation of this criterion. However CLEC comments were not the only source for data. Documentation reviews, Qwest interviews, Qwest observations and CLEC observations were also considered in the evaluation.
12.7	12.7-1-2	The loop qualification query process is consistent for retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-3	Processes and procedures are defined for addressing errors regarding loop qualifications in the retail and wholesale environments.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-4	The internal process flow used for loop qualification is consistent for retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-5	Qwest contact information is readily available for retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-6	The customer receives confirmation of the completion of a loop qualification, or can access the status of loop qualifications.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-7	Systems and processes are in place to allow wholesale and retail loop qualification queries to be performed using the customer address.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-8	Loop qualification response types that are provided are consistent between retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-9	The escalation process for loop qualifications is consistent for retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-11	Loop qualification performance measurement processes are consistent for retail and wholesale operations.	same as 12.7-1-1

14	14-1-6	Qwest provisions High Capacity circuits by adhering to documented method and procedure tasks.	KPMG testers independently verified that Qwest technicians adhered to the documented methods and procedures and that the loop characteristics met the technical specifications for the intended service. One of the three CLEC participated in this test.
14	14-1-7	Qwest provisions Loop Migrations (Hot Cuts) by adhering to documented method and procedure tasks.	KPMG testers independently verified that the Qwest technicians adhered to the documented methods and procedures and the loop characteristics met the technical specifications for the intended service. One of the three CLEC participated in this test.
14	14-1-15	Qwest provisions Analog Loops by adhering to documented method and procedure tasks.	KPMG testers independently verified that Qwest technicians adhered to the documented methods and procedures and the loop characteristics met the technical specifications for the intended service. Two of the three CLEC participated in this test.
14	14-1-18	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP-3A, B, D, & E – Installation Commitments Met for All Products.	Resale and UNE-P data used in this PID calculation was primarily gathered from one of the three CLECs. Data for other products was gathered from two of the three CLECs.
14	14-1-22	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP- 8B – Number Portability Timeliness for LNP Loops with Coordination.	KPMG testers independently verified that LNP Loops with Coordination were installed on committed due date/time. One of the three CLECs provided facilities. Orders were issued by the P-CLEC on behalf of the participating CLEC.
14	14-1-23	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP- 8C – Number Portability Timeliness for LNP Loops without Coordination.	KPMG testers independently verified that LNP Loops without Coordination were installed on committed due date/time. Eschelon was one of several CLECs that provided facilities. Orders were issued by the P-CLEC on behalf of the participating CLEC.
14	14-1-24	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP-13A – Coordinated Cuts on Time – Unbundled Loop.	KPMG testers independently verified that Coordinated Cuts of Unbundled Loops were installed on the committed due date/time. One of the three CLECs provided facilities. Orders were issued by the P-CLEC on behalf of the participating CLEC.

14	14-1-26	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-3A, B, D, & E – Installation Commitments Met for DS1 Loops.	KPMG testers independently verified that DS1 Loops were installed on the committed due date/time. One of the three CLECs participated in this evaluation. The PID calculation included commercial observations and test bed accounts.
14	14-1-28	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-4 A, B, D, & E – Installation Interval for DS1 Loops	KPMG testers independently verified that DS1 Loops were installed on the committed due date/time. One of the three CLECs participated in this evaluation. The PID calculation included commercial observations and test bed accounts.
14	14-1-29	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-5 – New Service Installation Quality All Products.	KPMG Consulting used data from Qwest on trouble history logs for all three of the CLECs along with several other participating CLECs.
18	18-1-1	Out-of-service trouble reports on wholesale services specified in PID MR-3 that require the dispatch of a technician are cleared within 24 hours.	KPMG observed employees from one CLEC initiate trouble reports and examined the corresponding Qwest trouble ticket. Results were incorporated into the calculation of this PID.
18	18-1-2	Out-of-Service trouble reports on wholesale services specified in PID MR-3 that do not require the dispatch of a technician are cleared within the defined interval.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-2-1	Out-of-Service and service-affecting trouble reports on wholesale services specified in PID MR-4 that require the dispatch of a technician are cleared within 48 hours.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-2-2	Out-of-Service and service-affecting trouble reports on wholesale services specified in PID MR-4 that do not require the dispatch of a technician are cleared within 48 hours.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-4-1	The mean time to restore wholesale services specified in PID MR-6 that require the dispatch of a technician is equal to or less than retail services.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-4-2	The mean time to restore wholesale services specified in PID MR-6 that do not require the dispatch of a technician is equal to or less than retail services.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-5-1	Repair of wholesale services specified in PID MR-9 that require the dispatch of a technician are made by the appointment date and time.	same as 18-1-2

CLEC Participation
Qwest 271 OSS Evaluation

18	18-5-2	Repair of wholesale services specified in PID MR-9 that do not require the dispatch of a technician are made by the appointment date and time.	same as 18-1-2
24.6	24.6-2-4	Interface specifications that define applicable business rules, data formats/definitions and transmission protocols are made available to customers.	KPMG Consulting conducted interviews with one CLEC to understand any issues and concerns with Qwest's MEDIACC EB-TA interface development processes. Information obtained during interviews was just one of several data points used in the analysis and determination of results.
24.6	24.6-2-5	On-call customer support for interface specifications is provided.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-7	Qwest has a documented methodology for conducting carrier-to-carrier testing with customers seeking to interconnect.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-8	A functional test environment is made available to customers for all supported interfaces.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-9	Carrier-to-carrier test environments are available and segregated from Qwest production and development environments.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-10	On-call customer support for interface testing is provided.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-11	Carriers are provided with documented specifications for active test environments.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-12	Active test environments are managed to version control. Carriers are notified before changes are made to active test environments.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-13	Procedures are defined to log software "bugs," errors, and omissions in specifications and other issues discovered during carrier-to-carrier testing.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-16	Business rules and software change tracking tools exist, are updated, and are shared with customers.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-20	Defects and required changes are identified and tracked during pre-production testing.	same as 24.6-2-4

Substantial Reliance

Test Number	Criterion	Evaluation Criteria	Comments
14	14-1-9	Qwest provisions ADSL Line Sharing circuits by adhering to documented method and procedure tasks.	KPMG testers independently verified that Qwest technicians adhered to the documented methods and procedures and the loop characteristics met the technical specifications for the intended service. KPMG testers primarily observed circuits from one of the three CLECs.
14	14-1-21	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP-4A, B, D, & E – Installation Interval for All Products.	Resale and UNE-P data used in this PID calculation was primarily gathered from one of the three CLECs. Data for other products was gathered from two of the three as well as other participating CLECs.
14	14-1-25	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-3A, B, D, & E – Installation Commitments Met for All Products.	Resale and UNE-P data used in this PID calculation was primarily gathered from one of the three CLECs. Data for other products was gathered from two of the three as well as other participating CLECs.
14	14-1-27	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-4 A, B, D, & E – Installation Interval for All Products.	Resale and UNE-P data used in this PID calculation was primarily gathered from one of the three CLECs. Data for other products was gathered from all three CLECs as well as other participating CLECs.

Other Reliance

Test Number	Criterion	Evaluation Criteria	Comments
18.7	N/A	None	KPMG Consulting conducted interviews with one of the three CLECs as well as two others to gather feedback pertaining to Qwest M&R work center interactions and experiences. KPMG Consulting used the information learned to place appropriate focus on those M&R work center process areas for which CLECs reported negative experiences
18.8	N/A	None	same as 18.7
23	N/A	None	KPMG Consulting conducted interviews with one of the three CLECs to understand Change Management processes and potential issues. None of the information obtained during the interviews was used to support conclusions reflected in the final report.
24.5	N/A	None	KPMG Consulting conducted interviews with one of the three CLECs to understand CLEC training issues and concerns. None of the information obtained during the interviews was used to support conclusions reflected in the final report.

Attachment 3

In light of the investigations underway in several states into Qwest's disclosure of agreements signed with Eschelon Telecom Inc., Covad Communications Inc., and McLeod USA (the CLECs), KPMG Consulting conducted a review of the Draft Final Report in order to identify specific test sections that contain conclusions that were based, in whole or in part, on representations, information, or data obtained from, or provided by the CLECs.

The results of that analysis were discussed with the ROC Steering Committee on Monday May 6, 2002, and with the ROC TAG on Thursday May 9, 2002. On the TAG call AT&T requested that KPMG Consulting revise its documents to reflect the participation of an expanded list of CLECs. KPMG Consulting agreed to do so.

Ms. Mary Tribby of AT&T provided KPMG Consulting with that expanded list via email on Friday, May 10, 2002. The additional CLECs include: Arch Communications Group; e.spire; GST Telecom; Nextel; US Link/Info Tel; VoiceStream; Western Wireless; and, WorldCom.

WorldCom requested that KPMG Consulting answer certain written questions about our CLEC Participation review. KPMG Consulting submitted its written answers to WorldCom's questions on May 22, 2002. During the hearings held in Washington during the week of June 3, 2002, WorldCom further requested that KPMG Consulting revise its written answers to the WorldCom's questions to reflect the participation of the additional CLECs. KPMG Consulting agreed to do so.

KPMG Consulting has revised its original Word document to reflect the history of this issue, and has also revised the companion Excel Workbook to reflect the additional information required to describe the participation of the additional CLECs.

In our original Word document, KPMG Consulting made no assertion as to the accuracy or completeness of the information provided to us by the participating CLECs. We affirm that statement. KPMG Consulting did not audit information provided to us by the participating CLECs, except to compare the information provided with corresponding information available from Qwest, when appropriate.

In addition, in our original Word document KPMG Consulting made no assertion as to whether or not the information received from the CLECs is representative of the "typical" CLEC experience. We also affirm that statement. KPMG Consulting made no attempt to investigate whether or not the information provided by one of the participating CLECs was consistent with information held by other CLECs.

KPMG Consulting is not aware of any evidence that suggests that Qwest has given preferential treatment to any of the participating CLECs in a manner that would undermine the credibility of the information relied upon by KPMG Consulting.

Upon review, the evaluation criteria presented in the Final Report fall into three categories with regard to reliance on information obtained from the CLECs:

- "No Reliance." -- no CLEC participation was required, or utilized, as a data point for drawing conclusions in the Final Report. This category represents the vast majority of the evaluation criteria contained in the Final Report.

- "Partial Reliance." -- CLEC representations, information or data was used as one data point among many. For example, in evaluating the ISC help desk, KPMG Consulting interviewed several CLECs, monitored HPC's observations and exceptions, interviewed the P-CLEC, conducted on-site inspections of the ISC and reviewed relevant documentation. In these cases, the representations made by any individual CLEC were simply one of several inputs used by KPMG Consulting to draw its conclusions. Attached is a list of evaluation criteria, by number, that qualify for this category.

- "Substantial Reliance." – CLEC representations, information or data was used as the primary source used by KPMG Consulting in drawing its conclusions. Attached is a list of evaluation criteria, by number, that fall into this category.

In addition, in the attached we describe seven other uses of CLEC information during the tests.

CLEC Participation
Qwest 271 OSS Evaluation

Test Number	Criterion	Evaluation Criteria	Comments
12	12-5-1	Qwest systems or representatives provide required order transaction functionality.	Information on functionality of submission of UDIT orders were one of many inputs considered in KPMG Consulting's analysis
12	12-11-2	Product and feature offerings are comparable for both retail and wholesale services.	KPMG Consulting considered CLEC input in the evaluation of this criterion. However, CLEC comments were not the only source for data. Documentation reviews, Qwest interviews, Qwest observations and CLEC observations were also considered in the evaluation.
12	12-11-3	Pre–Order and Order capabilities are functionally equivalent for both retail and wholesale services.	same as 12-11-2
12.7	12.7-1-1	The end-user information that is required prior to the submission of a loop qualification is the same for wholesale and retail orders.	KPMG Consulting considered CLEC input in the evaluation of this criterion. However, CLEC comments were not the only source for data. Documentation reviews, Qwest interviews, Qwest observations and CLEC observations were also considered in the evaluation.
12.7	12.7-1-2	The loop qualification query process is consistent for retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-3	Processes and procedures are defined for addressing errors regarding loop qualifications in the retail and wholesale environments.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-4	The internal process flow used for loop qualification is consistent for retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-5	Qwest contact information is readily available for retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-6	The customer receives confirmation of the completion of a loop qualification, or can access the status of loop qualifications.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-7	Systems and processes are in place to allow wholesale and retail loop qualification queries to be performed using the customer address.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-8	Loop qualification response types that are provided are consistent between retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1
12.7	12.7-1-9	The escalation process for loop qualifications is consistent for retail and wholesale customers.	same as 12.7-1-1

CLEC Participation
Qwest 271 OSS Evaluation

12.7	12.7-1-11	Loop qualification performance measurement processes are consistent for retail and wholesale operations.	same as 12.7-1-1
14	14-1-6	Qwest provisions High Capacity circuits by adhering to documented method and procedure tasks.	KPMG testers independently verified that Qwest technicians adhered to the documented methods and procedures and that the loop characteristics met the technical specifications for the intended service. One CLEC participated in this test.
14	14-1-7	Qwest provisions Loop Migrations (Hot Cuts) by adhering to documented method and procedure tasks.	KPMG testers independently verified that the Qwest technicians adhered to the documented methods and procedures and the loop characteristics met the technical specifications for the intended service. One CLEC participated in this test.
14	14-1-15	Qwest provisions Analog Loops by adhering to documented method and procedure tasks.	KPMG testers independently verified that Qwest technicians adhered to the documented methods and procedures and the loop characteristics met the technical specifications for the intended service. Two CLECs participated in this test.
14	14-1-18	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP-3A, B, D, & E – Installation Commitments Met for All Products.	Resale and UNE-P data used in this PID calculation was primarily gathered from one of the three CLECs. Data for other products was gathered from two CLECs.
14	14-1-22	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP- 8B – Number Portability Timeliness for LNP Loops with Coordination.	KPMG testers independently verified that LNP Loops with Coordination were installed on committed due date/time. One CLEC provided facilities. Orders were issued by the P-CLEC on behalf of the participating CLEC.
14	14-1-23	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP- 8C – Number Portability Timeliness for LNP Loops without Coordination.	KPMG testers independently verified that LNP Loops without Coordination were installed on committed due date/time; several CLECs provided facilities. Orders were issued by the P-CLEC on behalf of the participating CLEC.
14	14-1-24	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP-13A – Coordinated Cuts on Time – Unbundled Loop.	KPMG testers independently verified that Coordinated Cuts of Unbundled Loops were installed on the committed due date/time. One CLEC provided facilities. Orders were issued by the P-CLEC on behalf of the participating CLEC.

CLEC Participation
Qwest 271 OSS Evaluation

14	14-1-26	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-3A, B, D, & E – Installation Commitments Met for DS1 Loops.	KPMG testers independently verified that DS1 Loops were installed on the committed due date/time. One CLEC participated in this evaluation. The PID calculation included commercial observations and test bed accounts.
14	14-1-28	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-4 A, B, D, & E – Installation Interval for DS1 Loops	KPMG testers independently verified that DS1 Loops were installed on the committed due date/time. One CLEC participated in this evaluation. The PID calculation included commercial observations and test bed accounts.
14	14-1-29	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-5 – New Service Installation Quality All Products.	KPMG Consulting used data from Qwest on trouble history logs for several participating CLECs.
17	17-1-1	The user is able to enter a trouble report into EB-TA and receive a satisfactory response for at least 95% of transactions.	KPMG Consulting examined a participating CLEC's JIA and EBTA interface to evaluate the system's functionality and performance. KPMG Consulting designed the test cases, directed the CLEC as the test instances were entered, and based its evaluation on direct observation of the performance of the EBTA interface.
17	17-1-2	The user is able to request trouble report status from EB-TA and receive a satisfactory response for at least 95% of transactions.	same as 17-1-1
17	17-1-3	The user is able to add trouble information to an EB-TA trouble report and receive a satisfactory response for at least 95% of transactions.	same as 17-1-1
17	17-1-4	The user is able to modify trouble administration information on an EB-TA trouble report and receive a satisfactory response for at least 95% of transactions.	same as 17-1-1
17	17-1-5	The user is able to cancel a trouble report in EB-TA and receive a satisfactory response for at least 95% of transactions.	same as 17-1-1
17	17-1-6	The user is able to respond to trouble repair completion notifications and receive a satisfactory response for at least 95% of transactions.	same as 17-1-1
17	17-1-7	The user is able to conduct a Mechanized Loop Test (MLT) and receive a satisfactory response for at least 95% of transactions.	same as 17-1-1

17	17-1-8	The functionality of the wholesale trouble reporting system is comparable to the functionality of the retail trouble reporting system.	same as 17-1-1
18	18-1-1	Out-of-service trouble reports on wholesale services specified in PID MR-3 that require the dispatch of a technician are cleared within 24 hours.	KPMG observed employees from one CLEC initiate trouble reports and examined the corresponding Qwest trouble ticket. Results were incorporated into the calculation of this PID.
18	18-1-2	Out-of-Service trouble reports on wholesale services specified in PID MR-3 that do not require the dispatch of a technician are cleared within the defined interval.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-2-1	Out-of-Service and service-affecting trouble reports on wholesale services specified in PID MR-4 that require the dispatch of a technician are cleared within 48 hours.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-2-2	Out-of-Service and service-affecting trouble reports on wholesale services specified in PID MR-4 that do not require the dispatch of a technician are cleared within 48 hours.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-4-1	The mean time to restore wholesale services specified in PID MR-6 that require the dispatch of a technician is equal to or less than retail services.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-4-2	The mean time to restore wholesale services specified in PID MR-6 that do not require the dispatch of a technician is equal to or less than retail services.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-5-1	Repair of wholesale services specified in PID MR-9 that require the dispatch of a technician are made by the appointment date and time.	same as 18-1-2
18	18-5-2	Repair of wholesale services specified in PID MR-9 that do not require the dispatch of a technician are made by the appointment date and time.	same as 18-1-2
19.6	19.6-1-13	Procedures for CLEC retransmission requests are documented.	CLEC input was used to corroborate KPMG Consulting's findings.
19.6	19.6-1-14	CLECs can readily check the status of retransmission requests.	same as 19.6-1-13
20	20-2-2	Recurring rates on UNE bills are consistent with applicable tariffs and/or contract rates.	Data from UDIT orders billed to participating CLEC represented a very small subset of charges that were validated.
20	20-2-5	Non-recurring rates on UNE bills are consistent with applicable tariffs and/or contract rates.	same as 20-2-2

CLEC Participation
Qwest 271 OSS Evaluation

20	20-2-14	Calculations on UNE bills correspond with tariff and/or published definitions.	same as 20-2-2
20	20-3-1	Wholesale bill completeness as defined by PID BI-4A, is in parity with retail bill completeness.	same as 20-2-2
20	20-3-3	Wholesale bill accuracy as defined by PID BI-3A, is in parity with retail bill accuracy.	same as 20-2-2
24.6	24.6-2-4	Interface specifications that define applicable business rules, data formats/definitions and transmission protocols are made available to customers.	KPMG Consulting conducted interviews with one CLEC to understand any issues and concerns with Qwest's MEDIACC EB-TA interface development processes. Information obtained during interviews was just one of several data points used in the analysis and determination of results.
24.6	24.6-2-5	On-call customer support for interface specifications is provided.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-7	Qwest has a documented methodology for conducting carrier-to-carrier testing with customers seeking to interconnect.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-8	A functional test environment is made available to customers for all supported interfaces.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-9	Carrier-to-carrier test environments are available and segregated from Qwest production and development environments.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-10	On-call customer support for interface testing is provided.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-11	Carriers are provided with documented specifications for active test environments.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-12	Active test environments are managed to version control. Carriers are notified before changes are made to active test environments.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-13	Procedures are defined to log software "bugs," errors, and omissions in specifications and other issues discovered during carrier-to-carrier testing.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-16	Business rules and software change tracking tools exist, are updated, and are shared with customers.	same as 24.6-2-4
24.6	24.6-2-20	Defects and required changes are identified and tracked during pre-production testing.	same as 24.6-2-4

Substantial Reliance

Test Number	Criterion	Evaluation Criteria
14	14-1-9	Qwest provisions ADSL Line Sharing circuits by adhering to documented method and procedure tasks.
14	14-1-21	Qwest meets the performance benchmark for PID OP-4A, B, D, & E – Installation Interval for All Products.
14	14-1-25	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-3A, B, D, & E – Installation Commitments Met for All Products.
14	14-1-27	Qwest meets the parity performance requirements for PID OP-4 A, B, D, & E – Installation Interval for All Products.

Other Reliance

Test Number	Criterion	Evaluation Criteria	Comments
18.7	N/A	None	KPMG Consulting conducted interviews with one CLEC to understand Change Management processes and potential issues. None of the information obtained during the interviews was used to support conclusions reflected in the final report.
18.8	N/A	None	same as 18.7
23	N/A	None	KPMG Consulting conducted interviews with CLECs to understand Change Management processes and potential issues. None of the information obtained during the interviews was used to support conclusions reflected in the final report.
24.3	N/A	None	same as 23
24.4	N/A	None	same as 23
24.5	N/A	None	KPMG Consulting conducted interviews with one CLEC to understand Change Management processes and potential issues. None of the information obtained during the interviews was used to support conclusions reflected in the final report.
24.7	N/A	None	same as 23

Attachment 4

-----Original Message-----
From: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2002 10:53 AM
To: 'Rowe, Bob'; Bob Center
Cc: Denise Anderson; Dick Palazzolo; Tribby,Mary B - LGA; Finnegan,John F - LGA
Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review

Bob--

We will be initiating an appeal and I anticipate that will be done today.

We will be requesting that the review be extended beyond Covad, McLeod and Eschelon and expanded beyond the superficial inquiry previously done for those 3 carriers.

TCP

-----Original Message-----
From: Rowe, Bob [mailto:browe@state.mt.us]
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2002 10:11 AM
To: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA; Bob Center
Cc: Denise Anderson; Dick Palazzolo; Tribby,Mary B - LGA; Finnegan,John F - LGA
Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review

Tom,

I will respond to your core points. The decision concerning how AT&T wishes to proceed is of course yours. I want to ensure that you have accurate information upon which to base that decision.

1. Process: The Executive Committee and Steering Committee resolved appeals on an expedited basis fairly frequently during the test. The process simply involves shortening the time in which the Steering Committee and parties prepared the documents and scheduling an Executive Committee meeting out-of-cycle rather than waiting for the next scheduled meeting. Had you replied yesterday that you wanted to take an appeal, I would have started the process yesterday. If you tell me today, I will start the process upon receipt of your message, have a meeting in the next several days, with a decision by the end of the week.

2. Resources: AT&T would simply state the basis for its request, and its reason for disagreeing with the Steering Committee decision. AT&T has routinely prepared similar statements throughout this process, with a minimal incremental commitment of resources in each instance. Certainly, an appeal to the E.C. would consume fewer AT&T resources than would otherwise be required. My assumption is that you have most of your core points relevant to OSS test issues memorialized somewhere, for incorporation into a simple memo.

3. "Barking up the wrong tree": AT&T and the CLECs have a much better "record on appeal" with escalation of issues throughout the test than does Qwest. This speaks both to the overall fairness of the ROC process and to the ROC commitment to high quality results. I believe the present issue would be resolved on its merits if presented to the Executive Committee.

4. Sua sponte Executive Committee action: AT&T (and you personally) were harshly critical of perceived Executive Committee sua sponte action on a process issue late in the test (essentially, MTG's role in O&E meetings, which the E.C. initially referred to the Steering Committee). As you recall, I went into overdrive responding to your concerns on that point.

On this substantive issue, and with appropriate lessons learned from previous experience in mind, I am not inclined to step outside the process, especially when the process is clear and would be very simple for AT&T or any aggrieved party to follow. Perhaps more importantly, consideration of substantive issues is more productive when both sides are presented and advocated. Absent an appeal, this will be an information and discussion item on the 7-2 Executive Committee agenda. With an appeal, it will be an action item for immediate consideration.

I hope this message is fully responsive to the points you raise. Again, if you elect to appeal the issue, I will commence the process the moment I hear from you.

Bob Rowe

-----Original Message-----
From: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA [mailto:tpelto@att.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2002 8:01 PM
To: Rowe, Bob; Bob Center
Cc: Denise Anderson; Dick Palazzolo; Tribby,Mary B - LGA; Finnegan,John F - LGA
Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review

Bob--

I appreciate your offer of an expeditious review if AT&T appeals this issue and will discuss that with Mary Tribby.

However, having already been advised that we are "barking up the wrong tree," considering the inattention and indifference attended to this issue so far, and given the very finite resource AT&T has to apply in an increasingly short time I am not immediately convinced that resources should be pulled away from efforts better calculated to have some effect to slap together an "ASAP" appeal to the Executive Committee (though I admit to having an imprecise idea of what filing a worthwhile appeal would involve).

It is also quite clear that no meaningful evaluation or analysis can occur between now and July 3 regardless of what the Executive Committee might rule on an appeal.

Meanwhile, though, whether AT&T files an ASAP appeal or not, nothing I am aware of prevents the Executive Committee from independently taking sua sponte action to close such an obvious gap and make sure the results were not in any way effected by Qwest's efforts at alchemy.

I encourage the Executive Committee to do that.

TCP

-----Original Message-----
From: Rowe, Bob [mailto:browe@state.mt.us]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2002 4:54 PM
To: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA; Bob Center
Cc: Denise Anderson; Dick Palazzolo; Tribby,Mary B - LGA; Finnegan,John F - LGA
Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review

Tom,

If AT&T wants to appeal the Steering Committee decision to the Executive Committee, it should do so immediately. We can set a meeting and prepare the documents ASAP.

Bob

-----Original Message-----
From: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA [mailto:tpelto@att.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2002 4:41 PM
To: Rowe, Bob; Bob Center
Cc: Denise Anderson; Dick Palazzolo; Tribby,Mary B - LGA; Finnegan,John F - LGA
Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review

Bob--

Thank you for the response.

The reason this was raised with KPMG rather than the TAG was because KPMG had requested that we provide them with a list of carriers which are parties to the secret deals with Qwest. Per KPMG's request, we updated that list in light of the Arizona Staff identification of additional carriers, but now understand that KPMG is not planning to conduct even the cursory and incomplete analysis that was done with respect to Covad, McLeod and Eschelon.

An appeal that will not be ruled on until July 2nd when our FCC comments are due on the 3rd is neither a timely nor adequate remedy. Under the circumstances, we are compelled to raise the issue at the FCC and hope they take it more seriously than the Steering Committee.

I cannot help but note, with disappointment, the apparent role reversal between Arizona and the ROC. I would not previously have guessed that the Arizona Commission would be the one to take the time to consider issues that the ROC would choose to gloss over. I realize the timing of this is inconvenient and perhaps that is why the Steering Committee has decided not to pursue it, but lest we forget why we are where we are -- please remember that it was Qwest's illegal activity and botched cover up effort which caused these issues to arise when they did. Sadly, the Steering Committee's inaction has the effect of rewarding that behavior.

TCP

-----Original Message-----
From: Rowe, Bob [mailto:browe@state.mt.us]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2002 12:59 PM
To: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA; Bob Center

Cc: Denise Anderson; Dick Palazzolo; Tribby,Mary B - LGA; Finnegan,John F - LGA
Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review

Tom,

My understanding is that this issue took a lateral vector to get to the Steering Committee, as it had been raised with KPMG rather than with the TAG. However, it would seem that AT&T would now have the right to appeal this or any Steering Committee decision to the Executive Committee. If AT&T wishes to do so, we can add this to the July 2nd Executive Committee agenda.

Thank you,

Bob Rowe

-----Original Message-----
From: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA [mailto:tpelto@att.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2002 12:15 PM
To: Bob Center
Cc: Denise Anderson; Dick Palazzolo; Rowe, Bob; Tribby,Mary B - LGA; Finnegan,John F - LGA
Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review

Bob R./Dick--

To my knowledge, no state is looking at whether the reliance upon data from carriers which ostensibly received preferential treatment pursuant to secret deals with Qwest had any impact on the integrity of the ROC OSS test or the reliability of conclusions or results based on that data. Rather, the state investigations that I am aware of have focused on the issue of whether Qwest had a legal obligation to file those agreements and, if so, whether the failure to file should be punished. Although Arizona is currently considering collateral 271 impacts and may decide to investigate test impairment issues, it is not a party to the ROC OSS test.

Based on Joe Dellatore's message from yesterday, we now understand that ROC will also not be looking into the issue of whether there was any impact on the ROC OSS test as a result of this activity (whether legal or not) and has ceded authority to the individual states and/or the FCC.

In light of that direction, and in the absence of any independent inquiry, we will pursue the issue elsewhere.

TCP

-----Original Message-----
From: Bob Center [mailto:bcenter@mtgconsulting.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2002 11:11 AM
To: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA
Cc: Denise Anderson; Dick Palazzolo; Rowe, Bob; Tribby,Mary B - LGA; Finnegan,John F - LGA
Subject: Re: CLEC Participation Review

Tom,
You are barking up the wrong tree. Throughout the test MTG, as the project manager, did not set policy; rather, it was our responsibility to see that policy, as set by the ROC EC, SC and the TAG, was executed. The SC has given us very clear policy direction on this set of issues,

and that direction has been taken.

Because this is a ROC issue and not an MTG issue, I have copied this email to Dick Palazzolo (Chair, ROC SC) and Bob Rowe (Chair, ROC EC). Please direct any further communication regarding the relationship between "unfiled agreements" and the ROC OSS test to these two gentlemen.
Regards,
Bob Center

Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA wrote:

> Denise--
>
> I'm yet to hear the argument and accompanying explanation that this affected the integrity of the test either with or without any analysis to support that conclusion. If I'm wrong about that, please share with me the inquiry and investigation you've undertaken to demonstrate there was no impact on the integrity of the test and I'll stand corrected on my characterization. Or, if it is your position that this could not possibly impact the integrity of the test under any circumstances, please explain that, and I will again stand corrected. However, if preferential treatment of certain carriers could impact the integrity of the test (and I see little room for a credible claim otherwise) and you have undertaken no inquiry or examination to determine whether it did or not, then I must respectfully stand by this characterization. In that case, you are ignoring the issue and, near as I can tell, refusing to inquire or investigate.
>
> Alternatively, if you acknowledge that this could impact the integrity of the test, but have ceded authority at this point to the states and/or the FCC to investigate the issue, then we can accept that explanation, set aside the characterization and pursue the issue in those fora.
>
> TCP
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Denise Anderson [mailto:denise.anderson6@verizon.net]
> Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2002 9:25 AM
> To: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA
> Cc: Bob Center
> Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review
>
> Hi Tom,
>
> I do not believe that is an accurate characterization. The Steering
> Committee has indicated that most of the states is doing its own
> investigation of the "questionable deals" with independent dockets. If
AT&T
> has an issue, you can take it to those state proceedings designed to
address
> the topic.
>
> Regards,
>
> Denise
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA [mailto:tpelto@att.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2002 8:19 AM
> To: Denise Anderson
> Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review

>
> Denise--
>
> Why the head in sand approach on this?
>
> TCP
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Denise Anderson [mailto:denise.anderson6@verizon.net]
> Sent: Monday, June 24, 2002 12:23 PM
> To: Dellatorre, Joseph; Tribby,Mary B - LGA
> Cc: Marie Bakunas; Bob Center; Thielemann, Carrie L; Weeks, Michael;
> Wolters,Richard S (Rick) - LGA; Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA;
> Finnegan,John F - LGA
> Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review
>
> Hi Mary,
>
> Please remember that AZ is not a part of the ROC OSS testing effort and as
> such I believe that its recommendations may be interesting to note but
have
> no bearing on the 13-state test or any activity that the 13 ROC OSS states
> have determined is not to be done.
>
> Regards,
>
> Denise
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Tribby,Mary B - LGA [mailto:mbtribby@att.com]
> Sent: Monday, June 24, 2002 11:09 AM
> To: Dellatorre, Joseph
> Cc: Finnegan,John F - LGA; Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA; Wolters,Richard S
> (Rick) - LGA; Denise Anderson; Weeks, Michael; Thielemann, Carrie L
> Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review
>
> Thanks Joe. Denise, I will get back to you after AT&T discusses its
options
> in this regard. I think to the extent KPMG did the analysis in the first
> place, and it is now clear, based on the AZ recommended order that such
> analysis is incomplete, the additional work should be done to be certain
it
> is complete. Otherwise the analysis is fairly useless. To the extent
> states are investigating this issue, they are certainly not in a position
to
> analyze what effect data from involved CLECs may have had on the ROC OSS
> test.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Dellatorre, Joseph [mailto:jdellatorre@kpmg.com]
> Sent: Monday, June 24, 2002 11:22 AM
> To: Tribby,Mary B - LGA
> Cc: Finnegan,John F - LGA; Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA; Wolters,Richard S
> (Rick) - LGA; 'Denise Anderson'; Weeks, Michael; Thielemann, Carrie L
> Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review
>
> Mary,
>
> I've had a conversation with the Steering Committee and those folks let me
> know that they did not see any reason for another round of analysis on
this
> issue, particularly since most of the states are already conducting their

> own investigations into the subject. Unless otherwise instructed by the SC,
> KPMG Consulting considers this matter closed.
>
> Regards,
> Joe
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Tribby,Mary B - LGA [mailto:mbtribby@att.com]
> Sent: Monday, June 24, 2002 11:38 AM
> To: Tribby,Mary B - LGA; Dellatorre, Joseph
> Cc: Finnegan,John F - LGA; Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA; Wolters,Richard S
> (Rick) - LGA
> Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review
>
> Joe--
>
> I haven't heard back from you with respect to this request. Please let me
> know the status as soon as possible. If KPMG does not intend to do the
> analysis, I would like to raise the issue with the TAG, steering committee,
> or executive committee. Thanks very much.
>
> Mary
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Tribby,Mary B - LGA
> Sent: Monday, June 17, 2002 11:36 AM
> To: 'Dellatorre, Joseph'
> Cc: Finnegan,John F - LGA; Pelto,Thomas C (Tom) - LGA; Wolters,Richard S
> (Rick) - LGA
> Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review
>
> Joe--
>
> Attached is a Staff recommendation issued last week in Arizona in connection
> with the secret deals entered into by Qwest and various other Competitive
> Local Exchange Carriers. As you will see by the list of agreements in the
> order, there are a number of carriers identified as having been involved in
> these secret deals that we did not previously identify in our e-mail to you.
> AT&T would request that you update your analysis in your CLEC participation
> review to analyze whether any of the listed CLECs were involved in providing
> information to KPMG or other vendors during the test that was relied upon to
> any extent in reaching the conclusions reached throughout the test and in
> the final report. We think the value of your CLEC participation review is
> based, at least in large part, on its completeness and thoroughness in terms
> of the information contained therein.
>
> Thanks very much.
>
> Mary Tribby
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Tribby,Mary B - LGA
> Sent: Friday, May 10, 2002 12:01 PM

> To: 'Dellatorre, Joseph'
> Subject: RE: CLEC Participation Review
>
> Joe--
> Could you please pass this information on to Mike Weeks since I do not have
> his e-mail address.
>
> Mike--
> Here are the companies that we have seen to date allegedly involved in
> secret agreements in Qwest's region. I have seen only the names of these
> companies. I have not reviewed the agreements, so do not know whether they
> are actually interconnection agreements legally obligated to be filed or
> not. Nor have I made any attempt to determine whether any of these CLECs
> were involved in your OSS evaluations. I simply pass them on to be certain
> your information is complete:
>
> McLeod
> Eshelon
> Covad
> MCI WorldCom
> e.spire
> GST Telecom
> Nextel
> VoiceStream
> Western Wireless
> US Link/InfoTel
> Arch Communications Group
>
> Please call with any questions at 303-298-6508.
>
> Mary Tribby
>
****
> *
> The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged.
> It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else
> is unauthorized.
>
> If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution
> or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited
> and may be unlawful. When addressed to our clients any opinions or advice
> contained in this email are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in
> the governing KPMG client engagement letter.
>
****
> *

Attachment 5

AT&T Appeal of Steering Committee Decision
June 26, 2002

AT&T requests that the Executive Committee consider, on an expedited basis, the Steering Committee's decision that KPMG Consulting should not conduct any further analysis on the Final Report conclusions regarding the impact of data that KPMG Consulting obtained from CLECs that had entered unfiled agreements with Qwest. AT&T requests that KPMG Consulting be directed to perform that additional analysis.

On June 17, 2002 Mary Tribby sent Joe DellaTorre an email notifying Mr. DellaTorre that, through a proceeding on unfiled agreements in Arizona, there were more CLECs that had unfiled agreements with Qwest than AT&T was originally aware. Ms. Tribby requested that Mr. DellaTorre update KPMG Consulting's previous analysis on the degree that KPMG Consulting relied upon data obtained from CLECs that had unfiled agreements with Qwest. After a followup email from Ms. Tribby on June 24, 2002, Mr. DellaTorre responded in an email on June 24, 2002 that after a discussion with the Steering Committee, the Steering Committee "did not see any reason for another round of analysis on this issue, particularly since most of the states are already conducting their own investigations into the subject."

AT&T has two primary concerns with the Steering Committee's conclusion. The first concern is that the state proceeding will primarily focus on whether or not Qwest had a legal obligation to file the agreements. It is unlikely that the state proceedings will investigate whether or not the unfiled agreements had an impact on the integrity of the ROC OSS test. The second problem is that even if the state-specific proceedings do investigate the impact that unfiled agreements had on the integrity of the ROC OSS test, only KPMG Consulting is aware of how much or how little it relied upon information from CLECs that were subject to those agreements. KPMG Consulting needs to provide the facts about which CLECs with unfiled agreements it relied upon and the extent of that reliance.

AT&T also requests that KPMG Consulting be directed to review the unfiled agreements and analyze what impact those agreements may have had on the results and information it obtained from the CLECs with unfiled agreements. For example, at least one of the unfiled agreements had a term that required Qwest to have its order processing personnel physically located at a CLEC's order processing location. The special treatment of having Qwest personnel helping CLEC personnel create and submit LSRs would presumably be reflected in improved performance for that CLEC in terms of fewer rejected orders, higher flow-through rates and shorter intervals. KPMG Consulting has admitted that in attempting to determine what impact the unfiled agreements had, it reviewed none of the agreements or terms. KPMG Consulting should, therefore be directed to review the unfiled agreements and identify which of the terms and conditions of those agreements may have had an impact on the information that KPMG Consulting obtained from those CLECs.

AT&T only makes the request for expedited treatment of this appeal because comments to the FCC on Qwest's five-state application are due on July 3, 2002. It is critical that

KMPG Consulting's reliance on information from CLECs with unfiled agreements be understood before parties file their comments with the FCC.

Attachment 6

Executive Committee Decision on Impasse Appeal Regarding KPMG Consulting's Further Evaluation of CLECs with Unfiled Agreements
DRAFT

The Executive Committee (EC) met on June 28th to address AT&T's appeal (supported by MCI) of the Steering Committee's (SC's) decision not to have KPMG Consulting make additional updates to the CLEC participation analysis. After reviewing the impasse appeal document and discussion, the EC voted 5-0 to affirm the SC decision, and deny AT&T's request to reopen the KPMG study of CLEC participation in the OSS test.

Colorado, Iowa, Nebraska, Utah, Washington voted for the motion. Minnesota abstained. Montana presided and did not vote.

Factors contributing to the EC decision include:

1. The charter of the ROC OSS project does not extend to evaluation of non-OSS elements of Section 271 review.

2. The ROC Collaborative process did promptly evaluate and report on participation by CLECs in the OSS test, including participation by a number of specific CLECs. KPMG Consulting published its initial CLEC Participation Review on May 7th and provided a revised review on June 11th. These are available at http://www.nrri.ohio-state.edu/oss/master/execution/june/CLECParticipation_word.pdf [1]

   Most if not all of the affected CLECs that participated in the ROC OSS test have already been reviewed by KPMG Consulting. The sections of the OSS Final Report involving any reliance on input from these CLECs have been identified.

   The EC believes that the existing publicly available information provides parties with a sufficient record to make whatever advocacy arguments they deem appropriate.

3. In some states the record is closed; however, EC and SC members from states where the record is not closed also did not support reopening the CLEC participation study that has already been conducted.

4. It was also noted that some states, not most states, have initiated some type of review of the unfiled agreements. In general, these investigations do not address the impact of the agreements on the OSS test but rather the appropriateness of the agreements not being filed.

The ROC OSS test is concluded. This is the final OSS Collaborative action on this topic. The issue will now be the subject of advocacy by parties before state commissions and the Federal Communications Commission.

---

[1] The original 5/7 document is posted now and the 6/11 revised document will be posted soon, directly below the original.

Attachment 7

Performance Acceptance Certificate

Incident Work Order Number	AZIWO1076-1
Date/Time of Incident	04/11/01
Severity Level	1
Initiator	Robin Ferris
Date of Qwest Resolution	12/10/01
TAG Concurrence Date	

Description of Incident

The Change Request (CR) process used in the CICMP needs to be reviewed and re-designed in order for CRs to progress through the lifecycle in a much more timely fashion.

Despite the application of fairly conservative time intervals to individual steps of the CR process, the length of time it takes an average CR to make it through the process, not even taking into account making it into a release, is simply too long. If the length of time it takes a CR to actually make it into a release is taken into account, the length of time can double or even triple.

The primary culprits here are the once-monthly CICMP meetings and their relation to internal development meetings, and the frequency of software releases (releases are scheduled approximatley every four months).

The frequency of the CICMP meetings has the potential to slow down the CR process at several points. For instance, depending upon when a CLEC submits a CR, it can take anywhere from several days to an entire month for the CR to be initially "industry evaluated." If the CR requires clarification, it can take anywhere from several days to two months before it is discussed at its first CICMP meeting.

Having been initially discussed at the CICMP, meeting, the CR still has a minimum of two more CICMP meetings at which it must be discussed: once when it receives a "T-Shirt Size," and again after it has been prioritized and is baselined for release. If further clarification is required once the CR has been discussed at any of the aforementioned stages, the CR will need to come back to the CICMP once again. Each time the CR must come back to a CICMP meeting for discussion, there is the possibility that it will have to wait nearly a month for one to come along.

The attached table shows the lifecycle of CICMP CRs that were released in IMA/EDI version 6.0. Not counting CRs 4267810 and 5043023, which are process-related and not system-related, the average time it took the CRs to make it into a software release from their initiation was 12.5 months.

Resolution

Qwest Response Summary:

At this time Qwest has requested the Description of Incident to be clarified so that we can better understand what the specific incident(s) is we need to address in our response. The due date for the official Qwest Response will be determined based on the date we receive the clarification.

Qwest Supplemental Response 4/17/2001:

Qwest has initiated improvements to the CICMP process beginning in November 2000, and continues to implement improvements. These improvements have made it possible to reduce the time required for CRs to be "industry evaluated" to three business days. If a CR requires clarification, the current process requires the clarification to be provided immediately. Additionally, the "t-shirt size" is conducted immediately upon receipt of a CR rather than holding it for a scheduled review meeting. Once the CR is t-shirt sized, the CR is eligible for "industry prioritization".

 Copyright by Cap Gemini American, Inc., 2000 - all rights reserved.

Cap Gemini *PROPRIETARY* – Use Pursuant to Company Instructions

The time frame for a CR to be selected for a release can range from three days to six months and is determined by the:

- Date CR is received
- Priority it is given by the CLECs
- Industry/Business needs
- Available capacity in a release

The Qwest once a month CICMP meetings are in line with other ILECs such as SBC and Bell Atlantic (Verizon) which have both been approved by the FCC.

To meet emergency needs of the CLECs, Industry requirements, and Qwest system updates, the Qwest CICMP process demonstrates flexibility by allowing for changes to the scheduled releases prior to the Release Scope Commitment date.

CGE&Y Supplemental Response 8/29/2001:

In July 2001, Qwest began a comprehensive re-design of its CICMP process. The proposed re-design brings Qwest's process more in line with that of other RBOCs, specifically Verizon and Bell South, and with the proposed process outlined in OBF LSOP issue 2233.

Since these re-design efforts are still being discussed and collaboratively reviewed between Qwest and the CLECs, CGE&Y feels that it would be premature to close this IWO at this time.

Qwest Supplemental Response 10/25/2001:

The Change Request (CR) Processes used in the Change Management Process (CMP) have been reviewed, re-designed, and implemented.

Qwest conducted an assessment of the CMP (including the CR Process) during July, 2001. As a result of that assessment, which included feedback from the CLECs, Qwest proposed a number of changes designed to improve the CMP. The CLECs in attendance at the August CMP Monthly Meeting approved the changes. Qwest implemented the following measures to improve the timeliness and accuracy of the CR Process:

Project Managers were added to Qwest's CMP Staff to ensure the timely resolution of CRs and action items.

Qwest Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) now conduct a Clarification Meeting with the CLEC originator of a CR prior to the first CMP Monthly Meeting following receipt of a CR. The purpose of the Clarification Meeting is to ensure Qwest fully understands the CR and the expected deliverables.

Qwest SMEs conducted a Response Review meeting with the CLEC originator of a CR to present and discuss Qwest's proposed response to the CR. These meetings were held after the Clarification Meeting, but prior to the first CMP Monthly Meeting following receipt of the CR. Per the request of the CLEC participants who attended the September CMP Monthly Meeting, this practice has been discontinued. At the request of the CLECs, Qwest now presents its proposed response during either the first or the second CMP Monthly Meeting following receipt of the CR.

A database was developed to track CR status. The database houses all information pertinent to a given CR such as CR description, status, meeting minutes, draft and final responses etc. A report that captures all of this information is produced from the database and is provided on the web for the CLECs. This report provides near real time status on CRs.

An internal CR escalation process was established. Beginning two weeks before the CMP Monthly Meeting, CRs for which Qwest has not developed a response are escalated to the CMP Director on a daily basis.

The CMP Re-design Team, which is comprised of CLEC volunteers and Qwest participants, reached agreement on the interim CLEC Product and Process Change Request Initiation Process. This process has been implemented.

The CMP Re-design Team also reached agreement on the interim Qwest Product and Process Change Request

 © Cap Gemini Ernst & Young, 2000 - all rights reserved.
Cap Gemini Ernst & Young *PROPRIETARY* – Use Pursuant to Company Instructions

Initiation Process. This process is in the late stages of implementation. It will be fully implemented by November 15.

The OSS Interface Change Request Initiation Process was presented to and accepted by the CLEC participants who attended the September Systems CMP Monthly Meeting. This process was implemented on October 1, 2001.

The CMP Re-design Team reached agreement on the administration of CMP Monthly Meetings. This process has been implemented. Qwest expanded the CMP Monthly Meetings to 2 full days, per a request from the CLECs who participated in the September CMP Monthly Meeting. Please note that Qwest is willing to conduct CMP meetings on a more frequent basis, however, Qwest has not received a request from the CLECs to do so.

CGE&Y Supplemental Response 10/30/2001:

CGE&Y believes that AZIWO1076-1 should remain open for the following reasons:

- Although CGE&Y acknowledges that the CMP re-design process is being implemented piece-meal, as different parts are agreed upon, the process is still ongoing
- The specific subjects dealt with in the CMP IWOs issued by CGE&Y - "collaborativeness" of the CR review process, the lengthy lifecycle of CRs, and the timeliness of release of final EDI design worksheets - have not all been discussed, agreed upon, and/or implemented as part of the ongoing re-design process
- The above processes are either not at a complete enough stage, or have only just been implemented, and therefore CGE&Y is not yet able to make a confident assessment of them

CGE&Y acknowledges Qwest's statements made in its 10/25/01 supplemental responses to these IWOs, but feels it premature to close them due to the reasons stated above.

Qwest Supplemental Response 11/16/2001:

Qwest stated in the 10/25/01 response:

> *The CMP Re-design Team also reached agreement on the interim Qwest Product and Process Change Request Initiation Process. This process is in the late stages of implementation. It will be fully implemented by November 15.*

Qwest and the CLECs reached agreement on the interim Product, Process, and OSS Interface CR processes. Qwest will process CRs in accordance with these processes effective with those received on or after November 15, 2001. The documentation in support of these processes may be found in the
Master Red-Line document and the October and November CMP Re-design distribution packages, which reside on Qwest's CMP Re-design web site.

Resolution Submitted by:	Qwest	**Date:**	2/26/01 to 11/16/01

Verification of Resolution

In response to AZIWO1076, Qwest has implemented improvements to its current process (i.e., not the re-designed process) to address CR processing timeliness problems. The following changes have been implemented by Qwest:

- A new CR tracking database has been developed to enable CMP managers to better track the progress of CRs
- Because of the new CR tracking database, up-to-date CR reports are now available, sorted various ways, on the CMP website
- Each CR is now assigned a Project Manager so that each CR is now treated within Qwest as a Project

 © Cap Gemini Ernst & Young, 2000 - all rights reserved.
Cap Gemini Ernst & Young *PROPRIETARY* – Use Pursuant to Company Instructions

- A Director of Change Management is assigned so that the Change Management function within Qwest now has the requisite authority to direct the work necessary to effect the requested changes

The affect of the above changes is that CRs are now processed by Qwest and presented to the CLEC community in a much more timely manner than before. As a result, CGE&Y is recommending closure of AZIWO1076.

Verification completed by:	Robin Ferris	**Date:**	12/10/01

AT&T Comment (12/13/01):

It is premature to close this IWO before the CMP workshop scheduled for December 17 and 18, 2001. The workshop will provide CGE&Y and the TAG with information that should be sufficient to determine whether the underlying issues remain to be resolved or whether they will be resolved.

CGE&Y Reply (01/09/02):

Qwest has implemented the improvements previously outlined by CGE&Y; therefore this IWO remains closed.

TAG Recommendation ☐ **Approved** ☐ **Return to Qwest**

TAG Acceptance by:		**Date:**	

 © Cap Gemini Ernst & Young, 2000 - all rights reserved.
Cap Gemini Ernst & Young *PROPRIETARY* – Use Pursuant to Company Instructions

Performance Acceptance Certificate

Incident Work Order Number	AZIWO1078
Date/Time of Incident	02/23/01
Severity Level	1 .
Initiator	Robin Ferris
Date of Qwest Resolution	12/10/01
TAG Concurrence Date	

Description of Incident

"Final" EDI design documents are only released to the CLECs three weeks prior to a new EDI release. This issue has been repeatedly brought up at CICMP meetings by both the CLECs and third party EDI software vendors. Qwest has had the following answers to this issue:

1. "Draft developer worksheets," which are developed by the EDI developers during their design process, are issued to the CLEC community approximately 60 days before a release. They are updated as needed until the release is final.

2. EDI releases are supported by Qwest for six months after the release of a newer version.

The problem with item #1 above is that the "draft developer worksheets" are exactly that: drafts. Due to their sheer size, however, the fact that they may change over time is a significant hindrance to using them as a design document. It has also been observed, particularly with IMA release 6.0, that the design documents and business rules continue to be refined even after the system is placed in production.

When the above point has been made to Qwest in the past, however, the response has always been item #2: that a CLEC can always use the previous release for six months after a new release, thus giving them time to use the "final" design documents to modify their system. While this is certainly true, it doesn not really address the problem, as remaining with a previous software release prevents CLECs from taking advantage of any expanded functionality offered by a new release.

The existence of stable, unchanging requirements is an absolute pre-requisite to CLECs being able to code their own systems to match Qwest's. The lack of a true "requirements freeze" a sufficient time prior to production release, coupled with the lack of a true EDI testing environment, make it difficult for CLECs to successfully code their systems and do true user acceptance testing. IWO #AZIWO1068 has already been issued in regard to the EDI testing environment.

Resolution

Qwest Response Summary:

Qwest's EDI release documentation notification procedures give the CLECs adequate time to prepare for an EDI release.

Qwest distributes initial EDI release requirements, Draft Developer Worksheets (DDW), 196 to 166[1] days prior to the recommended[2] CLEC implementation date. SBC distributes initial requirements for application to application interfaces between 152 and 172 days before implementation.[3]

[1] All times given in days are approximate and assume 30.4 days per month.
[2] The recommended CLEC implementation date is the day the Addendum is distributed, 14 days after the release date.
[3] Texas decision at fn. 338.

 © Cap Gemini Ernst & Young, 2000 - all rights reserved.
Cap Gemini Ernst & Young *PROPRIETARY* – Use Pursuant to Company Instructions

Draft Developer Worksheets contain all the technical specifications and business rules necessary to create an EDI interface to Qwest's systems, except EDI maps and the Data Dictionary, which are included in the Disclosure Document. DDWs change very little between the time they're distributed and the time of the release; however, should changes arise, they are announced to the CLECs in the Disclosure Document.

The Disclosure Document is released 49 days prior to the recommended CLEC implementation date. The Disclosure Document contains the following elements:

- Developer Worksheets
- EDI Mappings
- Data Dictionary
- Business Descriptions
- Business Models
- Change Summary

Qwest opens a release to testing 42 days prior to the recommended CLEC implementation date; in other words, four weeks before the release is implemented CLECs can begin testing on a release. Although system changes may be necessary during the testing period, CLECs could have the majority of their systems tested before the release is implemented.

Any changes between the Disclosure Document release and the Release Implementation are given to the CLECs in the Addendum to the release, which is distributed 14 days after Qwest's implementation of a release. Qwest considers the Addendum as the "final" design document. Qwest agrees that a stable and unchanging environment is necessary for CLECs to be able to interface with Qwest; when the Addendum is issued, our system is "stable and unchanging." Qwest recommends CLECs migrate to the release after the Addendum is issued.

Qwest's EDI release documentation notification timelines meet or exceed industry expectations, demonstrated by comparing SBC timelines to Qwest timelines.

CGE&Y Supplemental Response, 8/29/01:

In July 2001, Qwest began a comprehensive re-design of its CICMP process. The proposed re-design brings Qwest's process more in line with that of other RBOCs, specifically Verizon and Bell South, and with the proposed process outlined in OBF LSOP issue 2233. This re-designed process also addresses the timeliness of design documentation distribution.

Since these re-design efforts are still being discussed and collaboratively reviewed between Qwest and the CLECs, CGE&Y feels that it would be premature to close this IWO at this time.

Qwest Supplemental Response 10/25/2001:

As part of the Change Management Process (CMP) re-design, Qwest has proposed to implement the following schedule effective with the IMA 10.0 Release. This schedule meets or exceeds the national industry standards as prescribed in OBF Issue 2233. This schedule will be discussed with the CLECs during the CMP Re-design meetings scheduled October 30 through November 1.

At the first CMP Monthly Meeting of each quarter, Qwest will provide a 12-month view of its OSS Interface Development Schedule.

Qwest will provide draft technical specifications at least 73 calendar days prior to implementing the release unless the Exception Process has been invoked. (Please note that the Exception Process may be invoked by either the CLECs or Qwest.) Technical specifications are documents that provide information the CLECs need to

 © Cap Gemini Ernst & Young, 2000 - all rights reserved.
Cap Gemini Ernst & Young *PROPRIETARY* – Use Pursuant to Company Instructions

code the interface.

CLECs have 15 calendar days from the initial publication of the draft technical specifications to provide written comments/questions regarding the documentation.

Qwest will sponsor a walkthrough for the CLECs beginning 68 calendar days prior to implementation. A walk through will afford CLEC Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) the opportunity to ask questions and discuss specific requirements with Qwest's technical team.

If the CLEC identifies issues or requires clarification, the CLEC must send Qwest written notification no sooner than 58 calendar days prior to implementation.

Qwest will review and respond to all CLEC issues, comments, or questions no later than 45 calendar days prior to implementation. This notification will include any changes made as a result of CLEC comments and will constitute the final technical specifications.

Qwest's planned implementation date will not be sooner than 45 calendar days from the date of the final technical specifications, unless the Exception Process is invoked. The implementation time line for the release will not begin until final technical specifications are provided. Emergency changes within the 30- calendar-day test window can occur without advance notification but will be posted within 24 hours of the change.

Resolution Submitted by:	Qwest	**Date:**	3/5/01 to 10/25/01

Verification of Resolution

The release of EDI design documents is a topic that is being negotiated through the CMP re-design effort. At the beginning of the process Qwest proposed that it would adhere to the OBF 2233 proposal which calls for the release of draft design documentation 66 caledar days prior to a release and final documentation 45 calendar days prior. This topic has not reached a consensus state among the core re-design team, but CGE&Y considers the OBF proposal to be a reasonable timeframe in which to release draft and final design documentation.

Because of the collaborative nature of the re-design process CGE&Y expects that whatever decision is reached as to the timeliness of EDI documentation releases will have been accepted by the majority of the CLEC community. As a result, CGE&Y is recommending closure of AZIWO1078.

Verification completed by:	Robin Ferris	**Date:**	12/10/01

AT&T Comment (12/13/01):

It is premature to close this IWO before the CMP workshop scheduled for December 17 and 18, 2001. The workshop will provide CGE&Y and the TAG with information that should be sufficient to determine whether the underlying issues remain to be resolved or whether they will be resolved.

CGE&Y Reply (01/09/02):

The latest "Master Red-Lined" CMP re-design document, dated 12-10-01, states, in part:

"Qwest's planned implementation date will not be sooner than one hundred (100) calendar days from the date of the final release requirements. The implementation time line for the release will not begin until final specification are provided"

 © Cap Gemini Ernst & Young, 2000 - all rights reserved.
Cap Gemini Ernst & Young *PROPRIETARY* – Use Pursuant to Company Instructions

This Language, if approved by the re-design team, exceeds the guidelines proposed by OBF.

It is CGE&Y's opinion that this IWO is to remain closed.

TAG Recommendation ☐ **Approved** ☐ **Return to Qwest**

TAG Acceptance by:		**Date:**	

 © Cap Gemini Ernst & Young, 2000 - all rights reserved.
Cap Gemini Ernst & Young *PROPRIETARY* – Use Pursuant to Company Instructions

Attachment 8

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

September 27, 1999

Nancy E. Lubamersky
Executive Director
Regulatory Planning
U S WEST
11 Upper Ardmore Road
Larkspur, CA 94939

Dear Ms. Lubamersky:

During the course of the last several weeks, members of the Common Carrier Bureau's Policy and Program Planning Division ("Division") have met with representatives from U S WEST to discuss third-party testing of operations support systems ("OSS") and the competitive local exchange carriers ("CLECs") access to those systems. The Commission has previously indicated that for a Bell Operating Company ("BOC") to obtain approval under section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to provide in-region, interLATA services, it must demonstrate that it provides to CLECs nondiscriminatory access to its OSS and that its systems are operationally ready and capable of handling reasonably foreseeable demand. A number of companies, including yours, have undertaken or are developing independent third party tests of their OSS.

The purpose of the discussions between Division staff and interested parties has been to provide guidance on important elements that a third-party test should include to assist our determination that a BOC is providing nondiscriminatory access to its OSS. These views represent the current thinking of the Common Carrier Bureau and are in no way binding on the Commission. Any final determination concerning whether a BOC is providing nondiscriminatory access to its OSS will be made based upon the record in a section 271 application. It is my hope, however, that the Bureau's views on these issues will be helpful to you and other Bell Operating Companies in formulating successful section 271 applications.

1. Performance Measure Evaluation

A thorough and well-documented independent assessment of the data collection and calculation processes for performance data will considerably facilitate the Commission's review of a section 271 application. An independent review of the performance measurements is crucial in determining the accuracy and validity of performance data. In particular, the staff believes that such an independent review would include the following qualitative and quantitative aspects.

- An evaluation would include an assessment of whether the raw data being collected by the BOC is accurate, which could be tested by observing the raw data collection processes and by comparing the BOC's raw data to independently-collected data.

- The evaluation would assess the processes by which the raw data is filtered and transformed into final, reported results.

- The evaluator would assess whether the BOC's data collection and data processing functions are consistent with the published performance measurement business rules.

- The evaluator would assess the adequacy and functioning of the BOC's internal controls over the data collection processes and the software programs that process the data (such as the controls over personnel access to the databases, and the controls that ensure that the programs and program modifications are properly authorized, documented, tested and approved).

- The evaluation would include an independent quantitative verification of the reported performance data. To accomplish this, the evaluator could be provided with the BOC's raw data and independently process the data, pursuant to the business rules, to ensure that the stated calculations and algorithms have been accurately applied.

We note that a comprehensive evaluation of the BOC's performance measure processes may include elements in addition to those listed above, as determined by the states or by an independent evaluator. Accordingly, we encourage BOCs to make the details of the proposed evaluation available to the Commission, and to the public, as they are developed.

2. Change Management Test

We also believe it critical that there be an independent review of a BOC's change management process and procedures as well as its implementation of these procedures.[1] The change management test should provide information which can be used to evaluate the methods and procedures that the BOC employs to communicate with CLECs regarding OSS system performance and system updates. The independent evaluator should assess the BOC's change management processes and should include, but not be limited to, a review of the BOC's ability to implement at least one significant software release. The following

[1] For purposes of this discussion, we use the phrase "change management process" as referring to the management of changes to OSS interfaces that affect CLECs' production or test environments. Such changes may include: 1) operations changes to existing functionality that impact the CLEC interface(s) upon a BOC's release date for new interface software; 2) technology changes that require CLECs to meet new technical requirements upon a BOC's software release date; 3) additional functionality changes that may be used at the CLEC's option, on or after a BOC's release date for new interface software; and 4) changes that may be mandated by regulatory bodies.

elements would be indicative, but not dispositive, of a satisfactory change management process and should be evaluated by the independent third-party:

- CLEC Participation: CLECs would have a role in the development of, and modifications to, the change management process.

- Release Implementation: Prior to issuing a new software release or upgrade, the BOC would provide a testing environment that mirrors the production environment in order for CLECs to test the documentation for the new release. The testing environment would be stable (*i.e.*, no changes by the BOC), and would be maintained for an adequate time-period, at least 30 days, for the CLECs to test. To ensure CLECs are not forced to cut over to a new release prematurely, a BOC could adopt a "Go/No Go" vote process to decide whether to implement a new release. Pursuant to this process the new release is delayed if a majority, such as two-thirds, of eligible CLECs vote to delay the release. Similarly, a BOC could maintain a pre-existing version, or versions, of the interface (*e.g.*, Electronic Data Interchange) when issuing a new release rather than switching directly from one version to the next.

- Memorialization of Process: The change management process would be clearly memorialized and set forth in one document that can be readily accessed by the CLECs. Any modifications to the change management process would be included with this document.

- Dispute Resolution: There would be a dispute resolution process for change management that is separate and apart from any process that is set forth in interconnection agreements. This would provide CLECs a forum specifically designated to resolve any change management disputes.

3. xDSL Testing

The third-party test would test significant volumes of xDSL orders (*i.e.*, xDSL capable loops).

4. Normal, High, and Stress Volume Testing

- Normal and High Volume Testing: The third-party test would test projected normal and high volumes of pre-order and order transactions that flow-through the BOC's systems.[2] The mix of transactions would replicate expected CLEC

[2] An incumbent LEC's internal ordering system permits its retail service representatives to submit retail customer orders electronically, directly into the ordering system. This is known as "flow-through." Similarly, a competing carrier's orders "flow through" if they are transmitted electronically (i.e., with no manual intervention) through the gateway into the incumbent LEC's ordering systems. Order flow-through applies solely to the OSS ordering function, not the OSS provisioning system. In other words, order flow-through measures only how the competing carrier's order is transmitted to the incumbent's back office ordering system, not how the incumbent ultimately completes that order. Electronically processed service

ordering patterns by including, for instance, error conditions and change orders, and by covering the process end-to-end (*i.e.*, through the receipt of order confirmation notice or electronic error notice). "Normal" volumes would be based on the BOC's reasonable estimate, with input from CLECs, of daily order volumes. "High" volumes would be significantly greater than normal volumes and based on the BOC's reasonable estimate, with input from CLECs, of forecasted demand.

- Capacity or Stress Testing: The third-party stress test would assess scalability of the BOC's OSS systems by testing a mix of transactions similar to those in the normal and high volume testing. These volumes would be significantly greater than the high volume test and be sufficient to identify potential weak points in the systems.

5. Pseudo-CLEC

If no CLEC has constructed an interface with whatever OSS system the BOC is relying on to meet the nondiscriminatory obligations set forth in the 1996 Act, the third-party tester should build a pseudo-CLEC. The pseudo-CLEC should build an interface not only to test the quality of the BOC's documentation for such OSS systems but also to ensure that these systems are capable of submitting and receiving valid transactions. The pseudo-CLEC should build the interface(s) using the BOC's documentation and business rules to determine whether any CLEC can build an interface based upon these materials. Third-party testing can be conducted using orders from a combination of existing CLECs and a pseudo-CLEC.

6. Dissemination of Information

A third-party test of OSS should include a formal, predictable and public mechanism for the third-party tester to communicate to both the BOC and the CLEC community issues identified by the third-party tester that arise during the course of testing. Staff proposes the following options for reporting problems:

- Report issues as they arise; or
- Issue reports pursuant to a specified time-frame (*i.e.*, weekly or bi-weekly); or
- Issue an interim report in the middle of the test and a final report at the end.

Combinations of these options could provide optimal balance between frequency and detail.

7. Functionality

- CLECs would be consulted in developing the test scenarios to reflect their market entry and growth and expansion scenarios in a particular region.

---

orders are more likely to be completed and less prone to human error than orders that require some degree of human intervention.

- Functionality testing would be conducted for pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, maintenance and repair, and billing transactions. The transaction mix should replicate CLEC ordering patterns and include, for instance, orders that fall out for manual processing, orders that contain errors, and order changes and supplements. Functionality testing also would test these transactions end-to-end (*i.e.*, orders should be actually provisioned), as applicable.

This letter is intended to provide a summary of staff views regarding key elements of a third-party test which could assist our determination that a BOC's OSS is operationally ready and capable of efficiently supporting ever-increasing volumes of transactions. It is not, however, intended to be an exhaustive list of the necessary elements for a successful third-party test. Moreover, it is possible that additional issues will be raised by interested parties in future section 271 dockets. I emphasize that any final determinations regarding whether a BOC is providing nondiscriminatory access to its OSS will be made by the Commission based on the record of the BOC's 271 application for a particular state. To this end, Bureau staff is committed to working with all parties to ensure that the section 271 application process is as orderly and predictable as possible.

For information purposes, a copy of this letter will be placed in CC Docket No. 98-121[3] and CC Docket No. 98-56.[4]

Sincerely,

Lawrence E. Strickling, Chief
Common Carrier Bureau

[3] Application of BellSouth Corporation, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Louisiana, CC Docket No. 98-121, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 13 FCC Rcd 20599 (1998).

[4] Performance Measurements and Reporting Requirements for Operations Support Systems, Interconnection, and Operator Services and Directory Assistance, CC Docket No. 98-56, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 13 FCC Rcd 12817 (1998).

Attachment 9

Decision No. R02-453-I

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

DOCKET NO. 97I-198T

IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION INTO U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S COMPLIANCE WITH § 271(C) OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

ORDER GRANTING, IN PART, AND DENYING, IN PART, QWEST'S MOTION TO SCHEDULE DATES FOR FULL COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS ON OSS, PUBLIC INTEREST SECTION 272 AND TRACK A AND PROCEDURAL ORDER, ORDER SETTING PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE, AND ORDER SETTING COMMISSION EN BANC WORKSHOP DATES

Mailed Date: April 23, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. STATEMENT, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS 2

1. Qwest's Compliance With Track A, Including Final Review of the SGAT 6
2. Public Interest 6
3. Pricing For Products and Services, If Any, For Which There Are Neither Interim Nor Permanent Prices 7
4. Section 272 of the Act 8
5. Other Matters 8
6. Change Management Process 9
7. ROC OSS Test 10
8. Filing and Procedural Requirements 11

II. ORDER 13

STATEMENT, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS

A. On April 8, 2002, Qwest Corporation (Qwest) filed a motion to schedule dates for full Public Utilities Commission (Commission) proceedings on OSS, public interest, section 272 and Track A (Qwest motion). Qwest also requested shortened response time. The hearing commissioner granted shortened response time, giving interested parties until April 12, 2002, within which to file responses to the Qwest motion. *See* Decision No. R02-404-I.

B. In its motion, Qwest seeks a full Commission hearing on the following issues: the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) test of Qwest's operations support systems (OSS), Qwest's compliance with section 272 of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act), the public interest (other than the content of the Colorado Performance Assurance Plan), Qwest's compliance with Track A, and any other issues necessary for the Commission to fulfill its obligations under section 271 of the Act. Qwest seeks a workshop before the full Commission during the week of May 6-10, 2002, and confirms that the vendors in the ROC OSS test are available for May 6 and 7. Qwest acknowledges that representatives of several competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) are not available due to already-schedule section 271-related proceedings in other states in Qwest's region.

C. AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc., and TCG Colorado (collectively, AT&T) filed a response to the Qwest motion. AT&T requests that the Commission not hold its hearing on the ROC test of Qwest's OSS until after the final ROC OSS test report is published. In the alternative, AT&T requests that the Commission hearing be held after the final Vendor Technical Conference (VTC) on the ROC OSS test. (The final VTC is scheduled for May 14-16, 2002.) These requests are based on AT&T's belief, supported by report revisions that occurred after the previous VTCs, that there may be -- indeed, probably will be -- revisions to the ROC OSS report following the VTC. Finally, AT&T notes the existence of scheduling issues.

D. Covad Communications Company (Covad) filed a response to Qwest's motion. First, Covad notes the existence of scheduling issues. Covad provides its available dates for late April, late May, and early June. Second, Covad requests that the Commission not hold its workshop until after the final VTC, scheduled for May 14-16. Like AT&T, Covad relies upon a recent decision of the ROC OSS Steering Committee. In that decision the Steering Committee opines that the final VTC will "serve to narrow and sharpen the participants' advocacy positions when state commissions conduct proceedings on the report, and will assist commissions and their staffs in their analyses of the report and participants' comments on it." Response at 2.

E. WorldCom, Inc. (WorldCom) filed a response to the Qwest motion. First, WorldCom notes the existence of scheduling issues. Second, WorldCom states that the draft final ROC OSS report is due on April 19, 2002. It argues that there is insufficient time to address the report and to prepare for the Commission hearing, particularly because it must prepare its written response to the ROC OSS test report during this time period. Third, WorldCom asserts that there is no final language for the Change Management Process (CMP) and will not be until perhaps some time in June, 2002. Fourth, WorldCom notes that the ROC OSS test vendors have closed as unresolved or as inconclusive at least five exceptions related to the CMP and to the stand-alone test environment (SATE). This means that the Commission will have to address the issue of the sufficiency of both the CMP and the SATE without the third-party independent tester having concluded its testing and without a recommendation from the vendor regarding the sufficiency of these items. WorldCom requests that the Commission not hold its last workshop until these areas are concluded.

F. Pursuant to Decision No. R02-425-I, the hearing commissioner held a status conference in this docket on April 17, 2002. At that conference, the hearing commissioner established the scope of the Commission workshop during the week of May 6, 2002, set filing requirements for further evidence

relating to CMP and postponed the final Commission workshop on the OSS test until after KPMG issues its final report. This order memorializes those decisions, and also establishes additional requirements.

G. I grant Qwest's motion to hold a workshop the week of May 6, 2002. Regrettably, it will not be the final one. Because parts of the OSS test have been re-opened, the final OSS workshop will now have to await the final KPMG report. Nevertheless, the Commission can go forward with a workshop from May 7-10, 2002, addressing the "public interest," § 272, and track "A.

H. To specify, the May 7-10 workshop includes: (a) Qwest's compliance with Track A, including final review of the Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions (SGAT); (b) the "public interest," including the state of competition in the local exchange telecommunications market in Colorado; (c) pricing for products and services, if any, for which there are neither interim nor permanent prices; (d) Qwest's compliance with § 272 of the Act; and (e) any other matters -- other than those related to the ROC OSS test -- which need to be considered in order for the Commission to make its recommendation on Qwest's compliance with § 271 of the Act. To facilitate an efficient use of time at the workshop, I order filings and procedures as follows:

Qwest's Compliance With Track A, Including Final Review of the SGAT

To assist the Commission and participants in this final workshop, I order Qwest to file a complete and final SGAT, including all exhibits, on April 26, 2002. This SGAT must be the SGAT which Qwest intends to file with its § 271 application to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The Commission requires that Qwest not change the Colorado SGAT, other than to incorporate changes ordered by the Commission, or to correct inadvertent mistakes, after this date. If they wish to do so, other participants may file comments on, corrections to, and legal argument concerning the sufficiency of, the SGAT on May 3, 2002.

Public Interest

a. On March 15, 2002, I issued my order on Staff Volume VII regarding section 272, the public interest, and Track A. *See* Decision No. R02-318-I. On March 22, 2002, AT&T filed a motion to modify that decision, to which Qwest filed a response on March 27.[1] In addition, both AT&T and Qwest have filed supplemental authority regarding the public interest. *See* filings of March 6 and of April 9, 2002. Parties are advised that, to the extent they may wish to address, or to file

[1] An order denying AT&T's Motion to Modify in its entirety is forthcoming.

supplemental comments on, public interest, they must do so in the April 26 and May 3 filings.

b. In addition, it is possible that, during the workshop, parties may wish to present witness testimony concerning the public interest, including the state of local competition in Colorado. Parties may do so. Procedures for presentation of witness testimony are set out below.

Pricing For Products and Services, If Any, For Which There Are Neither Interim Nor Permanent Prices

a. The Commission has issued its decision on rehearing, reargument, or reconsideration in Docket No. 99A-577T, the wholesale pricing docket. *See* Decision No. C02-409. With that decision the Commission has established interim or permanent rates for the products and services addressed in Phase I of that docket. Qwest shall include in Exhibit A to the SGAT it will file on April 26, 2002, the Commission-determined prices.

b. It is unclear at this point whether there are products and services for which no interim or permanent rates have been established. To clarify this situation, on April 26 Qwest shall file a separate statement identifying any wholesale product or service for which there is no Commission-established interim or permanent rate. In that filing Qwest shall explain to the Commission and the parties how prices for

those product and services will be established. If Qwest proposes to use interim prices until the Commission can establish permanent prices, Qwest shall provide each interim price. Other participants may respond to, comment upon, offer evidence concerning, this Qwest filing when they file their comments on the SGAT.

Section 272 of the Act

a. On March 15, 2002, I issued my order on Staff Volume VII regarding section 272, the public interest, and Track A. *See* Decision No. R02-318-I. On March 22, 2002, AT&T filed a motion to modify that decision, to which Qwest filed a response on March 27. Parties are advised that, to the extent they may wish to address, or to file supplemental comments on, section 272, they must do so in the April 26 and May 3 filings.

b. In addition, it is possible that, during the workshop, parties may wish to present witness testimony concerning Qwest's compliance with section 272 of the Act. Parties may do so. Procedures for presentation of witness testimony are set out below.

Other Matters

It may be that there are additional matters or issues, other than those related to the ROC OSS test which Qwest or other participants believe need to be addressed at this

workshop. To the extent such issues exist, they must be identified and addressed in the April 26 and May 3 filings.

Change Management Process

a. Exhibit G to the SGAT Qwest will file on April 26, 2002, contains the change management process (CMP). In that exhibit the Commission expects to see the language and processes agreed upon by the CMP redesign group.

b. In the participants' CMP briefs filed on April 8, 2002, it was obvious that Qwest did not address all of the FCC's criteria for a compliant change management plan. Rather, to support the arguments for a compliant Stand Alone Test Environment (SATE), documentation and technical assistance, Qwest simply referred the Commission to the ROC OSS test results. This was highly problematic, however, because there are many Observations and Exceptions in the ROC OSS test regarding change management, that have been closed as unresolved, unsatisfied, or still remain open.

c. At the status conference, I outlined three possible ways for the Commission to proceed on CMP. The first is to declare CMP as non-compliant and have that be part of this Commission's recommendation to the FCC. The second is to have Qwest hold its application to the FCC until participants can evaluate the next major release, 10.0, due in mid-June. The third is to allow Qwest another round of comments and

supplementary evidence to support its position that it has a compliant CMP that meets all the FCC's criteria.

d. Not surprisingly, Qwest preferred this third option. Therefore, Qwest is ordered to provide additional information to support its contention that its CMP meets all the FCC's criteria. As the FCC has stated in many of its § 271 orders, the best way to do this is by a demonstration of actual commercial usage. Short of that, a third-party tester's finding of compliance will suffice. With this information, Qwest must also provide all back-up supporting information so that CLECs and Commission Staff have full access to all documents Qwest has relied on to make its filing.

e. Other participants may comment and respond to Qwest's brief by May 3.

f. After reviewing these CMP briefs, the Commission will either set a stand-alone decision meeting, or wrap the CMP discussion into the final *en banc* workshop.

ROC OSS Test

a. I deny the Qwest motion to the extent it requests that the Commission establish hearings dates for presentations concerning the ROC OSS test. Based on my understanding of the state of the record, as discussed in Decision No. R02-425-I at ¶ I.E, and based on the discussion during the status conference, holding a Commission workshop on

the ROC OSS test at this time is premature. In addition, it would be premature to set any workshop dates until the date for the final report on the ROC OSS test is known.

b. Accordingly, Qwest is directed to file a motion to set a Commission *en banc* workshop on ROC OSS test-related issues, including any new data reconciliation information, at a future time. At the time it files this motion, Qwest shall include, and have considered, the dates of availability for the ROC OSS vendors to make presentations[2] and the dates of availability of other participants in this docket. The Commission notes that the week of June 3-7, 2002, is available on its calendar. These dates are not to be considered binding; they are offered by way of information.

Filing and Procedural Requirements

a. All filings must be in paper copy and there must be an electronic version of everything (including final SGAT and all exhibits) filed with the Commission. The electronic version must be a Microsoft Word® or Excel® document.

b. The Commission workshops are scheduled for May 7 through 10, 2002, beginning at 9:00 a.m. each day in Hearing Room A. These workshops will be on-the-record

[2] Witnesses representing KPMG Consulting and other ROC OSS vendors should be available to respond to Commission questions.

presentations before the Commission *en banc* concerning the issues discussed above. These four days of workshops will not include a discussion of the ROC OSS test, data reconciliation or CMP.

c. Because it is Qwest's application, Qwest shall be permitted to make both an initial presentation and a rebuttal presentation, if necessary. With that in mind, the workshops will proceed as follows:

May 7:	Presentation by Staff of the Commission
May 7 to May 8 at noon:	Presentation by Qwest
May 8 at 1 p.m. to May 9	Presentations by CLECs and other participants
May 10:	Presentations/rebuttal by Qwest

d. Parties should be available and ready to condense this schedule if presentations do not take as long as expected. Specifically, Qwest should be prepared to begin its presentation in support of its application immediately following Staff's presentation.

e. Participants making a presentation to the Commission, including if desired the presentation of witnesses, during the *en banc* workshops shall file, by May 3, 2002, at noon, an identification of the witness(es), an estimate of the time needed for each witness's testimony, and an estimate of the time counsel will require for oral argument.

ORDER

It is Ordered That:

1. The Commission *en banc* will hold workshops concerning Qwest Corporation's § 271 compliance beginning May 7, 2002, at 9:00 a.m. in Hearing Room A. The *en banc* workshops will continue through May 10, 2002.

2. Participants making a presentation to the Commission during the *en banc* workshops shall file an estimate of the time needed for their presentations and any accommodations necessary by noon on May 3, 2002.

3. The Qwest motion to schedule dates for full Public Utilities Commission proceedings on OSS, public interest, section 272 and Track A is resolved consistent with the proceedings scheduled above.

4. Qwest shall file its complete updated Statement of Generally Available Terms and Conditions, including all Exhibits, by April 26, 2002. Qwest shall file its second brief on CMP also by April 26, 2002.

5. Other participants' comments regarding the SGAT and Exhibits are due May 3, 2002. Other participants' comments regarding CMP are also due May 3, 2002.

This Order is effective immediately upon its Mailed Date.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

_____
Hearing Commissioner

L:\FINAL\R02-0453-I_97I-198T.DOC:LP