

## Operational Impact Review January 14, 2000 Minutes

**To: Line Sharing Team**

Jerry Shypulski [gshypul@uswest.com](mailto:gshypul@uswest.com)  
Stephen Moreno [smoreno@covad.com](mailto:smoreno@covad.com)  
Linda Miles [llmiles@uswest.com](mailto:llmiles@uswest.com)  
Caryn Anderson [canderson@northpointcom.com](mailto:canderson@northpointcom.com)  
Barbara Brohl [bbrohl@uswest.com](mailto:bbrohl@uswest.com)  
Mary Retka [mretka@uswest.com](mailto:mretka@uswest.com)  
Cliff Dinwiddie [cdinwiddie@northpointcom.com](mailto:cdinwiddie@northpointcom.com)  
Bill Campbell [wmcampb@uswest.com](mailto:wmcampb@uswest.com)  
Susan McAdams [smcadams@newedgenetworks.com](mailto:smcadams@newedgenetworks.com)  
Mike Radcliff [maradcl@uswest.com](mailto:maradcl@uswest.com)  
Suzy Swett [sswett@newedgenetworks.com](mailto:sswett@newedgenetworks.com)  
John Boynewicz [jboynew@uswest.com](mailto:jboynew@uswest.com)  
Mike Slater [m Slater@newedgenetworks.com](mailto:m Slater@newedgenetworks.com)

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

Joyce Frost	<a href="mailto:joyce.a.frost@mail.sprint.com"><u>joyce.a.frost@mail.sprint.com</u></a>
Paul Alexander	<a href="mailto:paul.alexander@mail.sprint.com"><u>paul.alexander@mail.sprint.com</u></a>
Jack Buettner	<a href="mailto:jack.buettner@mail.sprint.com"><u>jack.buettner@mail.sprint.com</u></a>
Rob Hisle	<a href="mailto:rob.e.hisle@mail.sprint.com"><u>rob.e.hisle@mail.sprint.com</u></a>
Teresa Jasper	<a href="mailto:teresa.jasper@mail.sprint.com"><u>teresa.jasper@mail.sprint.com</u></a>
Don Akers	<a href="mailto:don.c.akers@mail.sprint.com"><u>don.c.akers@mail.sprint.com</u></a>
Jo Gentry	<a href="mailto:jgentry@rhythms.net"><u>jgentry@rhythms.net</u></a>
Jill Wiesner	<a href="mailto:jwiesner@rhythms.net"><u>jwiesner@rhythms.net</u></a>
Brett Flinchum	<a href="mailto:bflinchu@covad.com"><u>bflinchu@covad.com</u></a>
Penny Bewick	<a href="mailto:pbewick@newedgenetworks.com"><u>pbewick@newedgenetworks.com</u></a>
Rob McMillin	<a href="mailto:rmcmillin@newedgenetworks.com"><u>rmcmillin@newedgenetworks.com</u></a>
John Hanson	<a href="mailto:jxhanso@uswest.com"><u>jxhanso@uswest.com</u></a>
Andre Bachelet	<a href="mailto:abachelet@rhythms.net"><u>abachelet@rhythms.net</u></a>
Linda Kosky	<a href="mailto:lkosky@uswest.com"><u>lkosky@uswest.com</u></a>
Linda Gale	<a href="mailto:ligale@uswest.com"><u>ligale@uswest.com</u></a>

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

Kevin Stover [kstover@uswest.com](mailto:kstover@uswest.com)

**From:** Jerry Shypulski

**Re:** OSS/ Operational Impact Review Meeting 01-21-2000

**Up-Coming Meeting Schedule:**

**\*\*\* Next OSS meeting 1/21/00 9:00-11:00 MST Bridge # 303-633-4874\*\*\***

**Agenda:** Discussion around proposal to OBF around Line Sharing LSR Standards  
Review OSS/GAP Matrix  
Review Action Issues  
Identify Items to be referred to Up-Coming Admin Team meeting

**\*\*\* No LSR or Repair Sub-Team meeting week of January 17<sup>th</sup>\*\*\***

## Operational Impact Review January 14, 2000 Minutes

### I. ACTION ITEMS

#### Pre-Order and Order

	Assigned to	Due Date	Action Items	Source <sup>1</sup>	Result
1	LSR Subteam		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create the proprietary LSR with appropriate ordering fields (e.g., the additional connection points: TN; NC/NCI field used for request type; and the CFA-like connections – splitter)</li> </ul>	10/15/99 #4  11/12/99 #2	12/17/99 LSR sub team met 12/15/99 CLEC request to use IMA as entry point and “push thru” order. -Sub Team researching -May be issues around order routing which may prevent. Priority List of LSR submittals -IMA -Email -Fax  12/30/99 Process has been worked out to use IMA 4.2 to submit LSR requests for Line Sharing. Job Aid created and distributed. Test set up for Tuesday 1/4/99 for DLECs to submit “Test” LSRs and USW to track.  01/07/00 Plan is to process a series of “walk-through” tests orders on Monday-Wednesday 1/10-1-12.

<sup>1</sup> Source refers to the Operational Impact Review Minutes Action Items

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigate submittal of LSR via e-mail</li> </ul>		<p>01/14/00  Reviewed this item and its association with OSS/Gap Matrix. Does this satisfy Interim Solution until OBF Long term solution?</p> <p>12/30/99  With the above IMA process, if a DLEC doesn't use IMA, LSRs will be submitted via FAX.</p> <p>01/07/00  IMA Test successful. Plan is to implement for orders in 1<sup>st</sup> three offices.  Co-Providers will confirm in writing their concurrence with IMA/LSR interim process and risks associated.</p> <p>01/14/00  Most Co-Providers have confirmed in writing their concurrence. Would like to close item by 1/21/00.</p> <p>01/21/00  The CLECs feel they have all done this. Jerry, please check to see if you have received them all.</p>
2	Linda Miles		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refine the estimates of the length of time needed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Establish edits for USOCs and FIDs</li> <li>➤ Load the tables with USOCs and FIDs</li> <li>➤ Obtain USOCs and FIDs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	11/12/99 #2	<p>12/17/99  USOCs and FIDS for Line Sharing had been established.  Upon receipt of LSR, USW will manually transfer LSR info into USOCs and FIDS.</p> <p><b>12/30/99 CLOSED</b></p>

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

3	LSR Subteam & Barb Brohl		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop long-term plan for OBF standard LSR to support line sharing and create the documentation required for submittal to OBF.</li> <li>• Determine how the request to implement the “standards-based” LSR will be prioritized (through this team or through the CICMP process)</li> </ul>	11/12/99 #1	<p>The next meeting is scheduled for February 2000.</p> <p><u>Process</u>  Must have the information to the committee 3 to 4 weeks in advance. Can walk issues in only if they are fully defined.  If there is a full interim between the two official meetings, issues can be reviewed.</p> <p>12/30/99  Will require discussion at next meeting 1/7/99 between DLECs and USW around the synergy between the USW Change Mgmt Process and the interaction with establishing OBF standards.</p> <p>01/07/00  Due to many members being missing this item was determined to be discuss as a group on next week’s call.</p> <p>01/14/00  Linda Kosky, USW OBF representative, will attend next Friday’s meeting and discuss the upcoming OBF and USW’s proposal for Line Sharing standards.</p> <p>01/21/00  Linda Kosky explained the OBF process. She is meeting internally first to ensure that the requirements are clear. She will be sharing her first draft with the CLECs sometime during the week of January 24, 2000 or January 31, 2000. (**Jerry, you need to find out and advise the CLECs with the minutes.***) After that, she will present it to OBF at the February 7 - 11, 2000 meeting. While</p>
---	--------------------------	--	--	-------------	---

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

					<p>this can take up to two years for approval, if worked in task forces outside of the scheduled committee meetings, it can be much quicker. After much discussion, it was determined that the absolute earliest date for OBF approval would be the August 2000 meeting.</p> <p>The group wants Linda Kosky to document the process that she described.</p> <p>The CLECs agreed that modification of the UNE loop form was appropriate. (rather than a new form)</p> <p>Linda advised the group who the OBF representatives were from Sprint, Covad, and NorthPoint. Rhythms and New Edge will identify their OBF representatives and advise Linda.</p> <p>The group agreed to queue the issue of prioritization of the implementation of the new LSR in IMA to the Administrative Issues Team.</p>
4	Jerry Shypulski and Bill Campbell		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the following pre-order information being provided, will a DLR be necessary? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ telephone number or address</li> <li>➤ total cable length [no individual gauge sections]</li> <li>➤ sum of the length of all bridge taps</li> <li>➤ presence of DLC</li> <li>➤ DB loss</li> <li>➤ presence of load coils</li> <li>➤ identification of missing segments)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10/22/99 #4, 5 & 6	<p>10/25/99  The conference call was held between USWC and DLECs.</p> <p>11/5/99  Bill Campbell will document the outcome of the call. Bill Campbell will document the outcome of the call. MLT is not currently available in pre-order. (It must be identified as a gap for Phase 1.5) Jerry Shypulski will provide documentation on MLT comparison to DLR for inclusion in Bill Campbell's document.</p>

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare pre-order information differences between IMA 4.2 and that described on 10/15/99, to the data provided on a DLR.</li> <li>• Is MLT available in pre-order and how does an MLT compare with a DLR?</li> </ul>		<p>12/17/99  Jerry will provide the documentation. There has been more information uncovered about MLT from Repair team to aid this documentation</p> <p>12/30/99  Feedback will provided at next meeting 1/7/99</p> <p>01/11/00  Documentation comparing MLT to DLR attached to this week's minutes- <b>CLOSED</b></p> <p>01/21/00  The CLECs requested that this action item be re-opened. U S WEST completed its assignment by providing the documentation to the CLECs, however, they still need to review the documentation and determine if a DLR is necessary.</p>
5	Linda Miles		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the process for the return of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Held Orders</li> <li>➢ Jeopardy Notifications</li> <li>➢ FOCs</li> <li>➢ Rejects</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10/29/99 #1	<p>12/17/99  Referred to the LSR sub-team to provide documented process.</p> <p>12/30/99  Examples of FOCs &amp; Rejects provided via LSR Sub-Team. Jeopardy notifications will be discussed at next LSR sub-team meeting.  Held Order Process will not be required per MN Stipulation Phase 1. Will be addressed in subsequent phases.</p> <p>01/21/00  Jeopardy Notification and Held Order processes are</p>



### Operational Impact Review January 14, 2000 Minutes

					Phase II, however, there can be some work started now. It is necessary to allow some of the shared line orders to process and then identify what needs to be developed. Linda Miles advised that she wants to follow the UNE Loop process for held orders and tweak as necessary. Cliff Dinwiddie requested that this process be documented now and then we can discuss the changes that may be necessary. Linda Miles agreed to check with Jerry Shypulski about the "loop cookbook." Linda agreed to check where the current documentation is and how it is packaged.
--	--	--	--	--	---

#### Repair

6	Repair Subteam		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and propose a detailed repair process, with attention to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Megabit™ trouble-shooting process</li> <li>➤ Identification of the testing that is available</li> <li>➤ MLT</li> <li>➤ Whether the RSAs are able to run MLT tests on the voice portion of the loop</li> <li>➤ Joint repair processes</li> <li>➤ How to provide trouble history for a shared line</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The repair process will address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Coordinated testing processes</li> <li>➤ Acknowledgement / communications</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The product must address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The definition of collocation must define test access and demarcation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10/29/99 #1  11/5/99 #3  11/12/99 #4, 5	12/17/99 Sub team met 12/16/99 and analyzed repair process and identified gaps to close from interim (1/10/99) perspective and a permanent perspective.  12/30/99 Continued on-going work being done by Repair Sub-team. Process will include DLEC ability to request MLT results. Repair process and testing results will be validated through a planned "walk-thru" of initial Line Sharing requests the week of January 10 <sup>th</sup> .  01/07/00 Will make Central Office technician available for Co-Provider testing on the series of Test Orders send 1/10/00.
---	----------------	--	--	---	---

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the splitter be the point of demarcation? (3 splitter location scenarios) The DLECs want test capability at the MDF side of the splitter – at the point where the cable goes into the splitter.</li> </ul> <p>The DLECs will agree that the demarcation be at the collocation side of the splitter =&gt; provided that the DLECs have testing access presence at the MDF side of the splitter and at the collocation side of the splitter.</p>		12/30/99 <b>CLOSED</b> Demarc established per Minnesota Stipulation
--	--	--	---	--	--

**Billing**

7			Define lower level billing processes	10/22/99 #9	12/17/99 CRIS will establish a separate CLEC summary bill for Line Sharing lines. The format will look the same as current bills for UBL. The CLEC will be provided a Miscellaneous account # for each line on the FOC. CLEC must keep track of Misc# to compare on bill.  12/30/99 <b>CLOSED</b> Summary Bill numbers for Minnesota provided to the DLECs via LSR Sub-Team.
---	--	--	--------------------------------------	-------------	--

**Customer Experience**

8			Address Customer Experience	10/29/99	12/17/99
---	--	--	-----------------------------	----------	----------

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More fully flush out voice customer-affecting experiences in the "End-User Behavior Matrix Proposal" with attention to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ DNP and Disconnect</li> <li>➢ T&amp;F (transfer of service to and from location)</li> <li>➢ Accounts that are resold, converted to UNEs, ported out, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Determine if U S WEST can notify the CLECs when the end-user "loses" his/her voice service from U S WEST</li> </ul>	#4, 5  11/5/99 #1, 2	<p>Jerry asked for feedback regarding the End User Behavior Matrix by next meeting.</p> <p>Discussion around end user notification. Basic questions asked were:  Is notification required? Why?  Who is responsible to notify?  What should notification communicate?  What form and input between CLEC &amp; USW?</p> <p>Both sides asked to confer with their Administration Team representatives for next meeting.</p> <p>12/30/99  Based on information from each group's Admin Team representatives, the Decision is End User notification is a DLEC responsibility. And each DLEC will provide their company notification process.  Standard USW information, such as reenforcing End User "Voice" repair process and telephone numbers will be provided by USW for inclusion in each DLEC notification.</p> <p>01/07/00  USW would like Co-Provider documentation to re-enforce End User to maintain repair calling process with their voice problems and Co-Providers use AMSC to call in their Data problems. <b>CLOSED</b></p>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------	--

**Miscellaneous**

9	Dennis Pappas		• Identify what CTAS can be used for, and does	10/29/99 #3	12/17/99
---	---------------	--	--	-------------	----------

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

			it have any application in a line sharing environment?		No status  12/30/99 <b>CLOSED</b> IMA is the current electronic bonding choice, so CTAS doesn't appear to be a solution.
10	Cliff Dinwiddie		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check wil Christine Mailloux on the Y-Splice / Half-tap issue.</li> </ul>	10/29/99 #6	12/17/99 No status  12/22/99 <b>CLOSED</b> Per Cliff Dinwiddie, Northpoint requests item be closed.
11	Caryn Anderson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that the dates on the Gap Matrix moved to timeframes acceptable to the CLECs, is it still necessary to define the difference between a bridge lift and a splitter and determine whether it can it be used here?</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE:</b>  <b>USW is inventorying POTS Splitters with the Legacy system SWITCH on an interim basis as miscellaneous equipment. This provides similar inventory results, on the interim, as bridge lifter theory.</b></p>	11/12/99 #3	12/17/99 The format that USW will use on an interim manual basis does resemble the bridge lifter assignment structure in SWITCH.  12/30/99 No update now. Item will probably be closed by next meeting.  01/07/00 No status this week.  01/14/00 Per Cliff Dinwiddie item can be closed. <b>CLOSED</b>
12	Barb Brohl, Jerry Shypulski, & Kevin Stover		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make a list of the documents provided during the Operational Impact Review and determine how to get them to the team (investigate e-mail or website)</li> </ul>	New	12/17/99 No status..still under investigation  12/30/99 No status at this time.  01/07/00 No status this week

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

				<p>01/14/00  Barb and Jerry will provide status next week.</p> <p>01/21/00  Barb Brohl advised that the list of documents has been developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action Items List</li> <li>• Process Flows</li> <li>• OSS Gap Matrix</li> <li>• Priority List of Offices</li> <li>• IMA LSR Modifications</li> <li>• Job Aids</li> <li>• OBF Status</li> <li>• Acronym List</li> <li>• Documents Filed with MPUC on 11/22/99 (possibly, need to check if any proprietary info)</li> </ul> <p>Those documents that do not change will be zipped, but those that do change (e.g. action items list, OBF status) will not be zipped.</p> <p>Barb advised the group that at this time, the files will e-mailed out on monthly basis. This will be a complete re-refresh. This is in lieu of a secure web site because it was not efficient to have resources work on this rather than the modifications that are necessary to make line sharing work.</p>
13	Barb Brohl		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine how the request to implement the “standards-based” LSR will be prioritized (through this team or through the CICMP process)</li> </ul>	<p>12/17/99  Barb wants to maintain emphasis on this for future meetings.</p>

**Operational Impact Review  
January 14, 2000 Minutes**

					12/30/99 CLOSED HERE (see below note) Moved this action item to Pre-Order/Order item number 3
14	Barb Brohl, Kevin Stover		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss long term OSS solution around the Telecordia/ SWITCH and Line Sharing</li> <li>Telecordia Interface Front Development</li> </ul>		01/14/00 New items to Action list. For discussion next week.  01/21/00 Kevin Stover advised that until a contract is signed, there is no official name or number. Once it is, Kevin will advise the group.  Kevin advised the group that we had no information regarding the Interface Front development effort, and if the CLECs are using it, they need to advise Telcordia who their ILEC partners are so that compatibility can be assured.