

Open Product/Process CR Detail

Report Line Number 1

CR #	Title	Date	Organization	Area Impacted	Products Impacted
		Current Status			
PC112202-1	Held Order Processes when Qwest does not have Facilities	Clarification 12/3/02	Wholesale ProdProc	Ordering	Lines / Loops

Director: Burson, Sue

Originator: Lorence, Susan

Originator Company Name: Qwest

Owner: Carlson, Barbara

CR PM: Macy, Cindy

Description Of Change

When a Local Service Request (LSR) is submitted for multiple lines/loops and Qwest cannot provision all of the lines/loops due to lack of facilities, there are several Held Order processes that may be invoked. However, there have been some gaps identified in these processes that need to be resolved. These are:

- Qwest does not consistently apply the Held Order process for Non-Designed orders which results in:
- IMA then does not reflect the correct status of the LSR
- CLECs are unaware of subsequent orders issued to their LSR by Qwest
- CLEC notification does not necessarily occur prior to Due Date
- What is the appropriate timing and notification process back to CLECs to make provisioning decisions; Input is needed from CLECs as to
- Which TN(s) does the CLEC want to move forward with
- Different decision criteria in handling conversion activity versus end-user moves
- CLEC input vs. end-user input when Qwest Tech is on-site

Qwest and the CLEC community will work together to resolve the gaps and modify the existing Held Order Processes when Qwest does not have facilities.

Expected Deliverable

Updated Held Order Process for Designed and Non-Designed when Qwest does not have Facilities

Status History

11/18/02 - Qwest issued a notification identifying this CR would be issued and it normally would be a Level 3 CR but Qwest believes the change would actually be best represented as a Level 4.

11/20/02 - November CMP Monthly Meeting - Qwest introduced this project as a walk on and advised an AdHoc meeting was held on October 29 to review the existing LSR processes when Qwest doesn't have facilities. During the October 29 meeting the team agreed this project should be handled utilizing the CMP Process. The CLEC community agreed during the November 20 CMP meeting that a CR should be issued and handled as Level 4.

11/22/02 - CR Submitted by Qwest

11/25/02 - CR acknowledged by P/P CMP Manager

11/27/02 - Contacted Susan Lorence to discuss CR. Clarification Meeting scheduled for 12/03/02.

12/03/02 - Held meeting with CLEC community to discuss the issues identified during previous working sessions. Qwest shared two options which would address the issues identified. The team discussed the pros/cons of each option. Agreement was reached that meeting minutes would be produced, the CR would be presented at the December CMP meeting and additional working sessions would be scheduled to discuss the options in more detail.

Project Meetings

Meeting Minutes -CLEC Meeting on Qwest Initiated CR PC112202-1
Held Order Processes when Qwest does not have Facilities
December 3, 2002, 2:00 – 3:30 p.m. MDT

In Attendance:

Mallory Paxton –Qwest Bonnie Johnson – Eschelon

Russ Urevig – Qwest Kim Isaac – Eschelon

Barb Carlson – Qwest Denny Graham - Qwest

Vivian Vigil – Qwest Wayne Hart – Idaho PUC

CR #

PC112202-1

Terry Kilker – Qwest LeiLani Hines – World Comm
Cindy Macy – Qwest Phyliss Sunnins - Qwest
Susan Lorence – Qwest

The team came together to continue to work on issues and gaps identified with the Held Order Process. The previous meeting was reviewed. Susan Lorence advised a CR was issued and Cindy Macy – CRPM, will manage this CR. This project will now be managed using the CMP guidelines. This project will be managed as a Level 4 CR, as agreed to during the November CMP meeting. This CR will be presented at the December CMP meeting. This meeting can be considered as a Clarification meeting.

The current process was reviewed. Barb Carlson advised the orders today are split 'on site' by the tech. A new order is generated for the lines that go held. The customer doesn't always get notified of this and billing can happen in error.

Qwest and the CLECs discussed two options and the pros/cons to each option. The issues and gaps were also mapped to the options so we know which option would address each issue. See the below matrix for these details.

The team agreed the discussion today was focused on Non Design, as that is the process that is causing the most issues. The team agreed the Design process should also be reviewed after we have decided upon the Non Design process.

Susan Lorence – Qwest asked if the volumes were high or low for this process and set of issues. Bonnie – Eschelon advised the volume is fairly low but the impact is high when it occurs.

The team agreed this process should be consistent within itself and not allow different processes for different situations, i.e. if the held order condition is found before the tech goes out or if the held condition is determined during provisioning. Another example is new install versus conversion.

Option A – Non Design Pro/Con

Continue to keep 1 LSR – split the order into what can be completed and the lines/loops that can't

Both the original LSR and the outstanding orders would be in Jeopardy status.

Qwest would need to attach the 2nd order to the LSR to prevent the LSR from completing.

Qwest would need to move ahead on the 2nd order ASAP to keep the LSR from completing.

The CLECs would NOT have input into which lines completed

Billing is based on the SOP and IMA completion report

Qwest would complete the lines available, usually in sequence as they are identified on the order. The tech may not completed one voice line and one fax line- lines would probably be completed based on the sequence on the order

Option B – Non Design Pro/Con

CLEC will split the LSR into what can/cannot be completed Original modified LSR and related orders would be completed. CLEC would create a new LSR/orders with only the lines that cannot be completed on it which would go into Jeopardy status.

CLEC would have control over which lines Qwest completed

Completions and notifications would be correct and the CLEC would be aware of what lines completed

All lines may go into Jeopardy if CLEC is not able to decide which lines to complete when the tech is on site.

The Jeopardy in this case would be a JEP to the customer if the customer were not able to advise us which lines to complete.

Tech would contact the center to contact the CLEC. The IMPCON would be contacted 1st then the Initiator if the impcon were not available.

Option B may have IMA impacts that we need to investigate. Kim-Eschelon brought up impacts to the Reserve # function in IMA. Numbers are reserved based on the PON. Option B would have a different PON on the 2nd LSR/order and the TNs would be reserved under the 1st LSR/order.

Issue / Gap Which Options addresses this Issue / Gap

Qwest does not consistently apply the Held Order process for Non-Design orders which result in the following issues:
IMA then does not reflect the correct status of the LSR Option A and B will address this issue.

Option A would require Qwest to make sure the LSR does not complete and the 2nd order is associated to the LSR.

Option B would ensure the LSR shows the correct status, as the CLEC would issue the 2nd LSR for the held lines.

CLECs are unaware of subsequent orders issued to their LSR by Qwest Option A and B will address this issue.

Option A would require Qwest to make sure the LSR does not complete and the 2nd order is associated to the LSR.

Option B would provide more clarity for the CLECs, as they would be making the decisions of what lines to complete and what lines to issue subsequent orders on.

CLEC notification does not necessarily occur prior to Due Date Option A or B would NOT address this issue. Qwest generally does not know

CR #

PC112202-1

before the due date that the order is held. Qwest would know ON the due date.
Option B would provide clearer notification as the CLEC would be making the decisions on what to do with the held lines.
What is appropriate timing and notification process back to CLECs to make provisioning decisions; Input is needed from CLECs as to the following:
Which TNs does the CLEC want to move forward with Option B would address this issue.
Option B gives the CLECs control over which TNs to complete and which ones to put on the 2nd LSR/order
Option A would NOT address this issue as the technician would decide which lines to complete, unless the end user is there to advise.
Different decision criteria in handling conversion activity versus end – user moves Option A would address conversion activity better
Option B would address end user moves better
CLEC input vs. end user input when Qwest Tech is on site The Technician should really be taking input from the CLEC not the end user.
Ultimately we both want to do what the end user requests.
Option B would allow for CLEC input as the CLEC would have control over which lines complete
Option A (may) allow for end user input if they are on site and advise the technician.

Action Item Assign to

What form of Notification will CLECs get when the order is split?

Bonnie advised she would think she would get an additional FOC and PSON for the 2nd order. She would expect to get the 1st FOC/PSON on the order, then when it goes held and if we split the order by creating a second order and /or LSR she would expect another FOC/PSON
Barbara Carlso

Determine IMA impacts to the 'Reserve TN# function' –

Option B may have IMA impacts that we need to investigate. Kim-Eschelon brought up impacts to the Reserve # function in IMA. Numbers are reserved based on the PON. Option B would have a different PON on the 2nd LSR/order and the TNs would be reserved under the 1st LSR/order.

Cindy Mac

Determine internal impacts to LSR/SO process for Option A and B- contact Char Mahs to discuss in more detail Barbara Carlson

Qwest Response

Initial Response:

12/03/02 - Held meeting with CLEC community to discuss the issues identified during previous working sessions. Qwest shared two options which would address the issues identified. The team discussed the pros/cons of each option. Agreement was reached that meeting minutes would be produced, the CR would be presented at the December CMP meeting and additional working sessions would be scheduled to discuss the options in more detail. Documenting or updating the agreed upon process will be the actual response to this CR.

CR #

PC112202-1