

CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign
 Combined Gap Analysis

#	Element/ Topic	Submitter(s)	Gap/Issues/Comments
141		AT&T	<p>Terms/definitions. CLECs and Qwest have not finished going through the terms drafted by Qwest.</p> <p>The Master Redline makes reference to a CR "status" in several places ("status is deferred", p. 14; "refer to status of existing changes", p.64; "walk-on with current status", p. 13). In addition the CR Form, item 21, refers to status. However, nowhere in the Master Redline are the various status types identified and described (e.g., presented, clarification, deferred, submitted, CLEC Test, development, etc.). This needs to be done.</p> <p>CLOSED 6/14/02]</p>
MISCELLANEOUS			
142	Documentation	Eschelon	<p>For Re-Design, it would be helpful if the action items in the log were grouped by subject matter (such as the headings in the Table of Contents), so that it would show outstanding issues by subject. This would be useful for comparing the log to the various gap analyses and determining which issues are not yet captured in the log.</p> <p>KPMG Exception 3093: Qwest lacks uniform standards and processes for document management. Qwest has provided, to CLECs, documents in which one or more fundamental items of reference, such as the author, business unit, release date, page numbers, version control, assumptions, and change logs, is absent.</p> <p>Develop and Document Versioning and Develop Version Change History Log ACTION ITEM #199</p> <p>KPMG Exception 3102 (moved from Observation 3044): Qwest's internal OSS interface change management documentation is inconsistent and unclear.</p> <p>Changes to technical publications & product catalog – need long-term process in Master</p> <p>Redlining of changes noted in notices. (This may be different from the versioning issue.) The business need is to ensure that CLECs can identify the changes, at the time of the announcement, so</p>

**CLEC-Qwest CMP Redesign
Combined Gap Analysis**

#	Element/ Topic	Submitter(s)	Gap/Issues/Comments
143	Finalization of CMP Processes and Documentatio n	Eschelon	<p>that they can determine how the changes may affect them. The content of notices, and the requirement to redline changes, need to be documented.</p> <p>In the interim, some changes have been communicated through notices, instead of CRs, because for example the changes were already reviewed in 271 proceedings. In the long-term, are there any changes for which CRs are not needed (such as typos) and how are those defined and handled?</p> <p>Is the EDI Implementation Guideline under the scope of CMP? ACTION ITEM #143</p> <p>Addenda to release software and documentation</p> <p>“[A]T&T Comment: We discussed that after the final specifications, there may be other changes made to documentation or the coding that is documented in the form of addenda. Is there another place in the Master redline where this will be addressed since it probably relates to new releases as well as new interfaces?]]” (Master, p. 37)</p> <p>Interim to final: Current language and implemented processes are interim. After all components are developed, need to review for consistency, gaps, etc.</p> <p>“Section X” references: At the end, need to insert references to the correct sections for these cross-references. If the “Section X” does not actually address the issue as anticipated, need to either revisit that Section or the one that referred to it.</p> <p>“URL to be established”: Either insert URL or, if the URL is likely to change, handle in a manner that does not require the document to change every time. (For example, “a URL identified on the CMP website under category X”?)</p> <p>Global terms: Once terms are agreed upon, need to ensure consistency in documents (such as CLEC and not Co-Provider, etc.). For example, p. 50 of Master uses “provider” for Qwest still. Is this correct?</p>