

Meeting Minutes

Treatment of SCR091002-01EXRG (Bill Format Changes allowing for inclusion of Third-Party reference TNs and URLs) As an Exception to CMP

**September 19, 2002 2 p.m.
Inverness Hotel – Conference Room D**

Meeting Start Time: 10:45 a.m.

NOTE: The meeting began at 10:45 a.m. MT. The meeting took place as an agenda item during the September Monthly Systems CMP Meeting. The Exception component of the meeting was originally scheduled for 2:45 p.m. but was rescheduled at the request of and without dissent from the CMP meeting attendees.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Exception Meeting was to decide whether to treat SCR091002-01EXRG (Bill Format Changes allowing for inclusion of Third-Party reference TNs and URLs) as an exception to the CMP. A vote was planned and noted in the agenda.

ATTACHMENTS

NOTE: Because the exception meeting took place as an agenda item on the Monthly Systems CMP Meeting a full list of CMP Meeting attendees can be found in the meeting attendees list for the September Monthly Systems CMP Meeting.

MEETING MINUTES

Michael Buck/Qwest summarized the CR as a request that has regulatory ramifications, however the Wholesale Change Management Process document indicates that a regulatory CR is not eligible to be a walk-on in the monthly CMP meetings, so the exception that Qwest is seeking is to allow this regulatory CR to be walked on as a regulatory CR.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - thanked Michael for the recap. He stated that on the Retail side of the house, Qwest had received an order out of Washington that basically required that they provide additional information on bills that are exclusive to ISC. There was an effective date on the initial order that Qwest couldn't meet. So Qwest went back to Washington and proposed a revised date. Washington approved the revised date and agreed to change the mandate to match up with the new Qwest date. The implication of this is that this will change the format of CLEC bills as well. Retail indicated that the change would impact the CLECs and confirmed the date. Wholesale looked at the date and indicated that in order for Wholesale to adhere to the Washington mandate, and adhere to the CMP process, the Draft Technical Specifications would need to be published by the end of September. Also, because this is a Regulatory CR it should have been brought to CMP last month. So Qwest is planning to post Draft Technical Specifications at the end of September in order to allow CLECs enough time to change their code, and to try as much as possible to adhere to the CMP. Jeff indicated that in order to do that, Qwest is looking to get agreement from the CLEC community on this exception CR to walk this CR into this arena.

Michael Buck/Qwest - added a brief note indicating that the notice that was sent out (and is provided in Attachment Q) includes an indication of the sections that Qwest believes are impacted and for which this exception that is being sought. He opened the discussion up for questions.

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

Carla Pardee/AT&T - indicated that the products currently listed as impacted are only BillMate and the paper bill. She asked if that should also include the CABS bill.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - confirmed that she was probably right and indicated that Qwest would take a look at this again and make sure that CABS is included.

Micki Jones/WorldCom - asked if anyone in the group were to vote No, would Qwest have any recourse?

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - indicated that that was an interesting point. He noted that Qwest is trying as much as possible to adhere to the process and that's why Qwest is asking for this exception. He reiterated that Qwest has this mandate in Washington that they had to go back and renegotiate the day on. He noted that Qwest is going to have to deliver this capability. He added that Qwest was presenting this to the CLECs and indicated that the exception being sought is the best way that Qwest knows how to provide this capability.

Minda Cutcher/Covad - asked if it really made sense to have an option for regulatory mandates in the Change Management Process. She apologized for bringing this up if it was an issue that had already been discussed in the redesign meetings.

Judy Schultz/Qwest - indicated that it was a really good question because when the redesign team developed the language around regulatory CRs, it was not anticipated that Qwest would ever be in a position where they had something that had to be implemented in a manner that would cause Qwest to have to ask for an exception to do a regulatory CR as a walk-on. She indicated that Qwest always anticipated that there would be at least enough lead time to fit it in the normal schedule of events. But given the implementation date that Qwest has to meet in this situation, the only way that Qwest can meet the advanced systems notification of timelines is to do it as a walk-on. So the alternative would be to miss the notification timelines giving the CLECs a shorter than normal amount of time. Qwest thought, from a CLEC perspective, it would be more desirable to try to secure agreement from this group that it was OK to do this as a walk-on and then comply with the rest of the process. She indicated that she did think that was something that would have to be revisited in redesign, due to the fact that this situation did occur.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - stated that she was a little confused because there is a process in CMP where the CLECs have to approve that they agree with Qwest that it is a regulatory mandate. She indicated that the process, the way it is done for the IMA releases or anything that is prioritized, is that the CR goes above the line and gets implemented when Qwest can implement it in the next release. She noted that this is a billing change, and before it could be placed above the line, the CLECs and Qwest would have to agree that it is a regulatory mandate.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - noted that the billing systems do not require prioritization and so the above or below the line issue does not apply.

Michael Buck/Qwest - indicated that Qwest has provided a proposal on how the CMP community would follow that process as best as possible and that it was documented in the exception notification.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - asked for clarification on what the CLECs were voting on today.

Michael Buck/Qwest - clarified that the vote was whether or not to allow this to be a walk-on. If the group approves it as an exception, then the process calls for agreement to be secured between the parties regarding the schedule of upcoming activities. So Qwest has provided what they propose to be the schedule of upcoming activities if this group were to approve this as a regulatory walk-on.

Bonnie Johnson/Eschelon - stated that Qwest is saying we can't have a discussion on whether or not we agree that this is regulatory unless we first agree that we can talk about it as a walk on. So we just need to agree that Qwest has permission to ask the CLECs if we agree that this is a regulatory change for discussion today.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - indicated that she didn't understand Bonnie Johnson's statement but wanted to ask a question in the aftermath. She apologized that she wasn't as familiar with this change, but if the CLECs agree that it is a walk-on today, would it require a unanimous vote?

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

Michael Buck/Qwest - confirmed that the Eschelon (Bonnie Johnson) interpretation was correct. Regarding the WorldCom (Liz Balvin) question, he confirmed that it did require a unanimous vote based upon the sections of the Wholesale Change Management Process document that would be altered.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - recapped that the unanimous vote would be to treat this as a walk-on, and that if anyone voted No, that Qwest can't even have this as a walk-on. She asked what Qwest's alternative would be. She noted that this is a problem and that this would need to be discussed in redesign. She asked for clarification that if this CR is followed, how did it impact Billing, and if there a competing resources for billing development for the next release?

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - indicated that there would be a couple of additional pieces of information that show up on the bill. He noted that Qwest has to give contact information to the user on the item to be serviced. He added that they wanted the third-party's URL and toll free number listed on the bill so the end user knows how to get a hold of their provider. He indicated the CLECs will have two pieces of information that they have not seen before on their bill before, and that when they receive them on their side, they will need to parse the information and process it correctly. To the question about competing resources the Billing system is not viewed as a resource constrained system and that CRs are scheduled based on their complexities and their do-ability. He noted that had the CR been do-able on the originally requested date, Qwest would have tried to put it in on that date. He indicated that from Qwest's point of view, this was the best date based on Qwest's technical feasibility. He added that from Wholesale's point of view, we are still negotiating the implementation of our CRs based on technical feasibility as well. He noted that this request would not be bumping something else out of that particular release.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - stated that she was a little confused by the actual vote that was on this notification. She asked if this notification was sent out, and afterward Qwest reevaluated the situation and determined that maybe Qwest needed to get it in as a walk-on first. Because this notice actually says a "Yes" will indicate a preference to treat this as an exception, following the alternative process suggested by the CR submitter. She indicated that it was not "Yes, we agree it's a walk-on".

Michael Buck/Qwest - indicated that in the last redesign meeting, there was obviously some consensus that there was an opportunity to tighten the language having to do with exceptions. Under the existing process, he thought it was fair to say that there is some vagueness over whether we are voting to treat this as an exception with a proposed process, or whether the vote is to treat it as an exception and then subsequently decide the approach. So Qwest is trying to work both sides of that issue by saying that we know that we need to treat this as an exception. So Qwest is putting out on the table, a proposal of what we can do. If what Qwest has proposed is workable, we can move forward.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - clarified that today we vote "Yes" or "No" that it's a walk-on. The next step you think would be that we take a vote to say we all agree it's regulatory?

Michael Buck/Qwest - noted that he could step through what Qwest said in the notice to see if everyone can get level set on that. As written in the notice (included in Attachment Q) Qwest outlined the three parts of the process document that are affected by treating this CR as a Regulatory Walk-On. The first impact is part of what Liz is talking about. Essentially, the community needs to have an opportunity to digest a change, assess whether or not we agree that it is regulatory, based upon the evidence, and then collectively say that it is regulatory and go forward with it as a regulatory change. Or, the opportunity exists for someone in the community to say "No, it's not regulatory" for whatever reasons, and it doesn't go forward as a regulatory change unless someone wishes to press the issue. The concern here seems to be the quantity of days. Michael indicated that as he read the language, the reasoning for requiring regulatory CRs not to be a walk-on is to make sure that all the parties have a chance to agree on its regulatory nature. So, Qwest played through the scenario that would have played out if this CR had been submitted by the deadline for the September CMP meeting, which was August 29th. At that point, Qwest would have sent out the required notice regarding a new regulatory CR. The CMP community would have had until eight days prior to the meeting to provide comments. That would have given everybody thirteen days to review the request and determine that Yes, you think it is regulatory, and you don't have any objections, or No, you do have an objection, and we want to get that put out on the table. So thirteen days seems to be the key. This request did not get to the CMP team until the 10th. So Qwest sent out the notice saying, here is a request to treat this as a regulatory CR. It seems like the best way to try and keep the process whole is to make sure that the community has at least those

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

thirteen days to consider whether it's a regulatory CR. Michael reiterated that this is all assuming that we can walk this CR on. He noted that if it can be walked on and if the CLECs are allowed to have 13 days from the date of the notice, it would put us out to the 23rd. If by the 23rd, someone wanted to say, "This does not look regulatory to us." a written statement would be submitted to Qwest saying, "We take objection to consideration of this as a regulatory CR. At that point, there is an obligation to come together as a group and decide on what are the merits of this as a regulatory CR. At that time, we would discuss any objection that have been raised, and discuss whether that objection is valid. We would go through a discussion and then ultimately vote either, "Yes. It is a regulatory CR" or "No. The objection is valid. It's not a regulatory CR". If there are no objections submitted to treat the change as a regulatory CR, there then becomes no need to have that second meeting to confirm what the lack of an objection signifies. Michael asked if that makes sense. There were nods around the room and no questions from the bridge.

Michael Buck/Qwest--added that what Qwest is saying here is that if we agree on the exception being sought, to allow this as a walk-on, Qwest still wants to make sure the community has a chance to assess its regulatory nature per the process. He noted that bringing this in as a walk-on would be an exception of the specific sentence that says regulatory and industry guideline CRs cannot be presented as walk-ons.

The last component of the exception involves when the discussion of objections is to take place. The process calls for objections to be discussed at "the next monthly CMP Systems meeting." Qwest's proposal would be, instead of waiting until the October Systems meeting, to have a vote on whether or not it is an exception before the October Systems meeting. Again, that would only be needed if someone objects to the treatment of this as a regulatory CR, and to do that prior to Qwest needing to send out the systems notification on the draft Technical Specifications which is scheduled to take place on September 30th.

Michael Buck/Qwest --noted that he just covered a lot of information and wanted to make sure everything made sense. He asked for thoughts from the participants.

Donna Osborne Miller/AT&T - recapped that what this is really about today is a vote on whether this is allowed to be a walk-on. She explained that the CLECs are to take it back, digest it for X amount of days, with whoever the principles are, and decide if it's truly a regulatory CR. Then after September 23rd there will be a conference call to deal with that piece of "Yes. It is" or "No. It is not".

Michael Buck/Qwest - indicated that she was correct. If there was agreement to allow this CR to be a walk-on Qwest has a proposal for how we might tackle the second part of dealing with the Regulatory part. Qwest proposes that if, by close of business on September 23rd, after everyone has had a full 13 days to evaluate whether this is a regulatory CR, if Qwest has not received any written statements saying that a CLEC objects and the reasons for that objection, that it seems like there's no need to have a meeting to get together to vote. So, in essence, not objecting to Regulatory treatment is confirmation that everyone is agreeing that it is a regulatory CR. Qwest would propose that we would cancel that proposed meeting if there were no objections. We could certainly go forward with it if anyone has the desire to get together and talk about it again.

Donna Osborne Miller/AT&T - asked how the comment process would work.

Michael Buck/Qwest - indicated that the process requires a written statement to the CMP manager via e-mail. If we're all in agreement, we could follow the process as described in the original notice from September 10, 2002.

Donna Osborne Miller/AT&T - asked if this was for the state of Washington only, and not inclusive of any other states?

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - confirmed that this was Washington only and not required in any other states. However, that due to the regional nature of the Qwest systems, this change would probably affect both Oregon and Washington.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance - wanted to make sure everybody is clear that the vote is to put this as a walk-on or not and that everyone has been discussing it and knows what it's about. So if any one person does not vote this as an exception, saying, "Yes. We can do this as a walk-on and have this discussion", which we are having now, then does the September 10th notification become null and void? And if we say "No. This isn't an exception to walk-on." what is the alternative to saying no we're not going to present this as a walk-on and none of this conversation has happened?

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

Michael Buck/Qwest - stated that there seems to be two options at that point. If we were saying that we do not treat this as a regulatory Walk-on, one option would be that Qwest continue to treat this as a regulatory CR and bring it through at a later date. And deal with not meeting the timelines as specified for implementation of the CR. Another option would be to drop the regulatory designation, just call it a walk-on and proceed. He asked Jeff Thompson/Qwest if he had any other thoughts.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - indicated that he worried about the September 30th notification window. He indicated that the process could be run either way. He noted that if the exception request to treat it as a walk-on was voted down, and Qwest had to take it through the normal regulatory process of doing the notification, and couldn't bring it to the meeting until next month, then Qwest would still want to publish the Draft Technical Specifications at the end of September to give CLECs the 73 day notice to allow them time for coding. Doing that would probably result in Technical Specifications being issued for something we have not fully discussed at CMP. He indicated that he didn't know how much of a problem that would cause. He added that if we said we didn't want to do this as a regulatory CR then Qwest is allowed to walk it on a normal CR. In that case, this whole issue goes away and then Qwest's gets a CR on the record for which we would publish Draft Technical Specifications at the end of the month. Qwest could move forward either way but the September 30th notification window is key.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance - noted that this is a good exercise because in redesign we cannot anticipate every scenario that is going to come up. He noted that we are learning again because this is one of those gray areas that was not well defined. But with the processes that we currently have in place, he understands why this has to be an exception to the walk-on process because it's a Regulatory CR and the process clearly says a regulatory CR will not be walked on. But with the nature of this one, it's kind of proven that the only way we can do this is through the exception process. He noted that he was personally clear that the vote was to make this an exception as a walk-on today and then we follow through with responding to the September 10th notification if we don't agree that it's regulatory. His concern was that this vote has to be unanimous and he wanted to hear what the intent of Qwest would be if it did not get accepted unanimously as a walk-on for regulatory.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - wanted to be clear because Jeff Thompson/Qwest talked about the mandate truly was against the Qwest retail systems.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - clarified that the mandate was for Qwest to provide this information on the bill.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - asked if in doing so, when Qwest actually implements the change, it would have an impact how CLECs receive their BillMate files.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - confirmed that Liz Balvin/WorldCom was correct.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - added that even though the change wasn't an IMA impacting change, that it was a retail change that impacted CLEC bills.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - confirmed that she was correct. He noted that when a Qwest retail or regulatory CR affects CLECs, Qwest is obligated to bring those forward.

Michael Buck/Qwest - asked if there were any additional questions or thoughts to provide clarity. He summarized the issue is whether or not to treat the CR that had been discussed as a regulatory walk-on this month. If it passed, then the community could discuss the scheduling of events that had been laid out by Qwest. Michael Buck/Qwest noted that since we had just completed another exception request and because no one had left the call or room, that the required quorum was still present.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - mentioned that Terry Wicks/Allegiance had said that Qwest was viewing this as an exception because of the way the document was written, although it's only Qwest's opinion at this point that it is a Regulatory CR. So from a redesign perspective, she didn't know that it is truly an exception, but she thought that everyone is clear in order to move forward in good faith, she thought we needed to approve this as a walk-on.

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

Judy Schultz/Qwest - indicated that Qwest is trying to do the right thing. That it is Qwest's belief that it is a regulatory CR and given that that's Qwest's thinking and the process precludes Qwest from bringing a regulatory CR as a walk-on, Qwest is wanting to be forthcoming. She stated that anybody has a right to disagree but that Qwest thinks that this way is most compliant.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - stated that the CMP process talks about everybody working in good faith and when we have these votes, someone can't say no just because they feel like saying no. She stated that she just wanted to bring that forward because there were new people attending the meeting and that we are learning as we go and that Qwest and the CLECs can't think of every aspect of everything that's going to come forward but that we have all tried, and that we have all learned more by exercising the process.

Michael Buck/Qwest - asked if there were any other questions or final comments. There were none. He began the vote roll call.

Allegiance – Yes

AT&T – Yes

Covad – Yes

Eschelon – Yes

Integra Telecom – Yes

McLeod – Yes

NC Telecom – Yes

POPP – Yes

Time Warner Telecom – Yes

Qwest – Yes

US Link – Yes

VarTec – Yes

WorldCom – Yes

Z-Tel – Yes

Michael Buck/Qwest - asked if he had missed anyone. He had not. He stated that given that it had carried unanimously as required, we needed to engage in a discussion on what does the schedule of follow up events look like. He noted that he could recap and asked if everyone thought that it seemed like a workable way to make sure that we try to keep the processes as whole as possible.

Terry Wicks/Allegiance - stated that he would agree that we should follow the processes as they have been outlined.

Others in the room nodded in agreement.

Michael Buck/Qwest - asked if anyone on the bridge had any comments. There were none. Michael noted that the information in the notice appears to maintain its validity and that there is a comment cycle that would end on September 23rd to indicate whether there was a formal objection to treating this as a regulatory CR. He asked that if by September 23rd, Qwest has not received any formal objections, is there a desire to go forth with the meeting on September 24th. No participants voiced a desire to have the meeting if no objections were received. Michael

Qwest Wholesale Change Management Process (CMP) Meeting Minutes

indicated that Qwest would make every effort via mailouts and e-mails to notify everyone if the meeting is to be cancelled.

Judy Schultz/Qwest - added that she wanted to thank everybody.

Michael Buck/Qwest - mentioned that a notice would be forthcoming to provide logistics for the call on September 24th should such a call become necessary. Again, plan on being there unless you receive a second notice that says there were no objections received.

Liz Balvin/WorldCom - mentioned that Jeff talked about documentation and she wanted to prepare WorldCom's billing folks in the event that this would proceed in those areas. She asked when the documentation would be sent out.

Jeff Thompson/Qwest - indicated that Qwest is targeting September 30th.

Michael Buck/Qwest — Asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

Meeting End Time: 11:20 a.m.