-----Original Message-----

From: Clauson, Karen L.
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2002 6:38 PM
To: Mscott@cc.state.az.us
Cc: 'Joanne Ragge'; lfarmer@cc.state.az.us; MAD@cc.state.az.us; D1S@cc.state.az.us; eric.s.heath@mail.sprint.com; thc@lrlaw.com; mpatten@rhd-law.com; chines@kelleydrye.com; jsburke@omlaw.com; thomas.f.dixon@wcom.com; thc@lrlaw.com; mpatten@rhd-law.com; gharris@lrlaw.com; richard.smith@cox.com; danielwaggoner@dwt.com; gregkopta@dwt.com; tracigrundon@dwt.com; rwolters@att.com; dsekich@att.com; decook@att.com; rhip@bellatlantic.net; hagoodb@bellsouth.net; joyce.hundley@usdoj.gov; aisar@harbor-group.com; aisar@millerisar.com; dhsiao@rhythms.net; swakefield@azruco.com; dpozefsky@azruco.com; Clauson, Karen L.; mhazzard@kelleydrye.com; garylane@primenet.com; andrea.harris@allegiancetelecom.com; tberg@fclaw.com; tdwyer@fclaw.com; mjarnol@uswest.com; mluckri@uswest.com; csteese@steeselaw.com; jdowens@uswest.com; acrain@uswest.com; nlubame@uswest.com; mbumgar@uswest.com; lsimpso@uswest.com; tfreebe@uswest.com; jragge@uswest.com; rlanphi@uswest.com; sacik@perkinscoie.com; dschneid@fclaw.com; rkim@uswest.com; cattanach.robert@dorseylaw.com; drfinch@att.com; MJRosenstein@HHLAW.com; mdoberne@covad.com; mzulevic@covad.com; nmirabel@covad.com; barbara.c.young@mail.sprint.com; Clauson, Karen L.; tory.bishop@kutakrock.com; jill.vinjamuri@kutakrock.com; cpost@mail.state.ne.us; geneh@mail.state.ne.us; 'Conn, David R.'; 'connolly@csusa.net'; 'Finnegan,John F - LGA'; Frame, David M.; Johnson, Bonnie J.; Prescott, Deborah
Subject: Cap Gemini data reconciliation

Maureen:

We have a few questions about the Cap Gemini data reconciliation and would like to discuss them when you have a chance. I left you voice mails about this and some other issues, but I know how busy you are. Maybe we can schedule a time to discuss, perhaps even a conference call when Cap Gemini is here at Eschelon this week.

Cap Gemini described what had been decided about the scope of Cap Gemini's work. We would have liked to have been included in those discussions with them and Qwest, so that we understood it better. Other CLECs may have also had an interest. Based on what Cap Gemini said during our call on Friday, a decision was made to limit the work to off-net orders (UNE-Star and UNE-P) for May 2002. And, if we understand it correctly, to look at OP5/processing of service orders for those types of orders. We have suggested that both April and May 2002 be included to provide enough information for review. We also had thought that the review may look at other issues we raised in the workshop and, in particular, billing. Cap Gemini said that billing issues would not be included, not for UNE-Star or UNE-P. They said something about a decision or agreement to look at billing, if at all, after the migration of some UNE-Star lines to UNE-P. The issue exists now (and has for some time), however, and we do not know why the review should be delayed. Also, the billing problems are not limited to UNE-Star and include the issues we raised with respect to UNE-P bills. Cap Gemini mentioned the term "shore up," but we didn't know what that meant, and we didn't discuss specifics. Cap Gemini said that we should ask you about that issue.

We also had a question about which off-net orders would be included in the work, because the number of LSRs that Cap Gemini initially mentioned in a previous call was higher than the number Eschelon submitted for new off-net orders. As discussed at the workshop, orders for migrations from UNE-Star to UNE-P for existing customers are hand-held and are not part of the normal process that we understand is being tested. The numbers sounded as though they may have included the migration, as well as new, orders. Cap Gemini didn't necessarily think so, because they had identified or were looking into whether some loop orders had been inadvertently included. We would like to know what orders are being included and ensure we are all on the same page.

In response to our questions about the scope of the work, Cap Gemini indicated that Qwest was not willing to pay for additional work. In addition, Cap Gemini said that Qwest pointed to the level of work required. As a small company, we are concerned about the resources required as well, but we still believe we need to look at these issues. We understand that Cap Gemini is funded by Qwest and cannot determine scope by itself. We are hoping to discuss these issues with you. Cap Gemini will be here tomorrow and Thursday. Please let me know if you are available to discuss these issues this week. I believe there is also a TAG call tomorrow.

Because the TAG call time conflicts with our meeting with Cap Gemini, I don't believe we'll be able to have someone on that call. Perhaps you could forward this to that distro as well and they could discuss it, if that is an appropriate forum.

Thank you,

Karen L. Clauson
Sr. Director of Interconnection
Eschelon Telecom, Inc.
730 2nd Ave. South, Suite 1200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612-436-6026
Fax: 612-436-6126