



***Wholesale Process and System Review &
Proposal Summary***

- Event Notifications
 - Review When to Notify
 - Fix Lead Time
 - Visibility
 - Workarounds
 - Severity Levels
 - Expectations of Event Notifications ‘completeness’
- CR Initiation
- Documentation – Release Specific
 - Appendix F Review
- Documentation – Non Release Dependent
- Testing

Business Problems Defined by the CLECs



- Unanticipated impacts and results – Did the systems change do what we told it to do.
- The CLECs believe EDI and GUI documents do not reflect the system functionality.
- The CLECs perceive that the system is not working the way the document says and the document is correct.
- The CLECs believe there are times when the system is doing something that is not documented at all.
- EDI disclosure and addendum changes that require coding changes but the CLECs feel they don't get enough lead time.
- The Event Notification is coming out and that Qwest identifies that a patch is necessary and the patch date is TBD and the CLECs believe they often do not provide enough lead-time with documentation.
- The Event Notification has a patch date of TBD and the CLECs believe Qwest does not provide enough lead-time with documentation.
- The LSR is being rejected even though the EDI documentation states optional vs. conditional. The backend system is editing those fields and requires the CLEC to populate the field.
- The CLECs believe that the Event Notification process is broken and the CLECs have no where to go to review all problems.
- The CLECs believe the workaround process is defined by Qwest whether the CLEC agrees or not with the workaround. The CLECs perception is that Qwest's centers often don't understand the workaround.
- The CLECs believe that the PCAT gets updated with the business rules and don't get filtered back to system documentation.
- The CLECs believe EDI and GUI are not working the same. A field may be available in one but not the other.
- The EDI disclosure addendum change requiring coding on the CLEC side and CLECs believe that the Event notification does not provide enough information and is not timely.

Pending CMP CRs



- PC041503-1CM - Add to section 4.0 TYPES OF CHANGE CLEC impacting defect (MCI)
- PC093002-05X Revised Title: EDI documentation guidelines - Original Title: Single Source Document for Implementing (MCI)
- PC073003-1 Qwest to provide test plans and results prior to deployment of IMA (MCI)
- SCR063003-02 Develop test capability in GUI to allow testing before major and point releases. Currently Qwest offers SATE testing for EDI, Qwest should offer similar testing in the IMA GUI. (Eschelon)
- PC063003-1CM CMP CR status of "reactivate" added to statuses available for a CR (Eschelon)
- PC022703-9X Support Production Defect Report (crossed over from SCR022703-09) (AT&T)

Business Issues and CMP CRs have been categorized and will be reviewed in the following order:

- Event Notifications
- CR Initiation
- Documentation – Release Specific
- Documentation – Non Release Dependent
- Testing

Event Notifications



- EDI disclosure and addendum changes that require coding changes but the CLECs feel they don't get enough lead time.
- The Event Notification is coming out and Qwest identifies a patch is necessary and the patch date is TBD. The CLECs believe they often do not provide enough lead-time with documentation.
- The Event Notification has a patch date of TBD and the CLECs believe Qwest does not provide enough lead-time with documentation.
- The CLECs believe that the Event Notification process is broken and the CLECs have no where to go to review all problems.
- The CLECs believe the workaround process is defined by Qwest whether the CLEC agrees or not with the workaround. The CLECs perception is that Qwest's centers often don't understand the workaround.
- The CLECs believe EDI and GUI are not working the same. A field may be available in one but not the other.
- The EDI disclosure addendum change requiring coding on the CLEC side and CLECs believe that the Event notification does not provide enough information and is not timely.
- PC041503-1CM - Add to section 4.0 TYPES OF CHANGE CLEC impacting defect (MCI)
- PC022703-9X Support Production Defect Report (crossed over from SCR022703-09) (AT&T)

Qwest Proposal – Event Notification



- **Determining When to Notify**
 - Share Research Findings
 - Review Current Guidelines
 - Discuss adding Event Notification options via the IT Wholesale Help Desk

- **Fix Lead Time**

- Provide enough information in the Event Notification and allowing enough time for the CLECs to manage their code changes.
 - Discuss the CLEC timing needs
- Qwest modified documentation Event Notifications for EDI Disclosure to include what the documentation currently states and what the updated documentation will state with the date and version of the disclosure addendum. (June 2003)

Qwest Proposal – Event Notification



- **Visibility**

- Update the Event Notification URL with:
 - Provide a list of active events.
 - Link the events from the list to the event history.
- Redefine active events to include all events until the fix is deployed.

Qwest Proposal – Event Notification



- **Review Workarounds**

- Review Qwest pre-approved workarounds.
- IMA 14.0 CMP SCR 111102-03 Ability for Qwest to accept LSRs will decrease workaround complexities.

- **Severity Level**

- Wholesale IT System Help Desk is where severity levels are assigned.
- Will re-train the Wholesale IT System Help Desk to:
 - Assign severity level based on CLEC needs
 - Document CLEC's reason for severity level.

- **Expectations of Event Notification ‘completeness’**
 - 1st Event Notification due out immediately
 - Qwest understands a potential problem exists but may not have enough time to clearly state impacts or workarounds
 - Status updates will provide more clarity
 - By the time the Event Notification closes there will be a clear description of trouble, a workaround if appropriate, and a closure disposition of date tbd or patch date.

CR Initiation



- Unanticipated impacts and results – Did the systems change do what we told it to do.
- PC063003-1CM CMP CR status of "reactivate" added to statuses available for a CR (Eschelon)

- **Clarification Meeting Thoroughness**
 - Clear Definition – All information/definition must be provided rather than just examples
 - Expected Deliverables – expected results and acceptance criteria included in the CR
 - Updates/revisions to the CR after clarification would be done by the CR originating company
 - Qwest response and/or an LOE will not be completed until definition is final

Documentation has two sub-categories

- Release Specific – will propose solutions enabled during the release cycle.
- Non Release Dependent – will propose solutions outside of the release cycle.

Documentation – Release Specific



- Unanticipated impacts and results – Did the systems change do what we told it to do.
- The CLECs believe EDI and GUI documents do not reflect the system functionality.
- The CLECs perceive that the system is not working the way the document says and the document is correct.
- The CLECs believe there are times when the system is doing something that is not documented at all.
- The LSR is being rejected even though the EDI documentation states optional vs. conditional. The backend system is editing those fields and requires the CLEC to populate the field.
- The CLECs believe that the PCAT gets updated with the business rules and don't get filtered back to system documentation.
- PC093002-05X Revised Title: EDI documentation guidelines - Original Title: Single Source Document for Implementing (MCI)

- **Unanticipated Release Impacts & Results**

- Discuss Options

- Continue to Post Draft Disclosure per the 73 day guideline
- Move the CLEC Walkthru to 45-40 day time frame and include Release Review, QLSOG & EDI Disclosure
- Create an Agenda to manage attendance
- Include Business Process Specialists, IT Analysts and EDI Support

- **Documentation Differences**

- Review High Level Process
- Notify via Trouble Ticket or EDI Implementation Team

Documentation – Non-Release Dependent



- The CLECs believe EDI and GUI documents do not reflect the system functionality.
- The CLECs perceive that the system is not working the way the document says and the document is correct.
- The CLECs believe there are times when the system is doing something that is not documented at all.
- The LSR is being rejected even though the EDI documentation states optional vs. conditional. The backend system is editing those fields and requires the CLEC to populate the field.
- The CLECs believe that the PCAT gets updated with the business rules and don't get filtered back to system documentation.
- CLECs should open trouble tickets
- Trouble tickets should be managed through the production support process (addresses first four issues).
- Qwest internal process to review all changes and coordinate documentation updates (addresses fifth issue).

Qwest Proposal - Documentation – Non-Release Dependent



- **Documentation Issues**

- Trouble Tickets should be opened and managed through the production support process
- Qwest will conduct internal review & coordinate documentation updates if applicable

Testing



- PC073003-1 Qwest to provide test plans and results prior to deployment of IMA (MCI)
- SCR063003-02 Develop test capability in GUI to allow testing before major and point releases. Currently Qwest offers SATE testing for EDI, Qwest should offer similar testing in the IMA GUI. (Eschelon)

Qwest Proposal – Testing



- **Test Support**

- Qwest may consider executing CLEC test scenarios and providing results
- Clarification meetings would be held to define scenarios
- Test scenarios would be for IMA only & may have impacts on release capacity