

-----Original Message-----

From: Novak, Jean [email redacted]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2003 2:26 PM  
To: Clauson, Karen L.  
Cc: Hanser, Paul H.; Miles, Linda; Kelly Cameron; Schultz, Judy  
Subject: RE: input into template proposed interconnection agreement process

Karen, this is not a CMP issue, I will take this. thanks, jean

**From:** Clauson, Karen L.  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 04, 2003 2:24 PM  
**To:** 'Novak, Jean'; 'Judith Schultz'  
**Cc:** Hanser, Paul H.; 'Linda Miles'; 'Kelly Cameron'  
**Subject:** input into template proposed interconnection agreement process

I'm not sure to whom at Qwest to direct this request, so I am starting with you, Jean and Judy. (I have already asked Linda Miles, and she wasn't the one.) Please provide this to the appropriate personnel at Qwest (including those working on the template) who can respond to this request, if not you.

This email relates to a template interconnection agreement that Qwest is preparing. (Contract negotiator Linda Miles of Qwest has described that template process to us and may describe it to you as well, if you are unfamiliar with it.) Eschelon understands that generally Qwest may make whatever proposal it chooses in negotiations and, if the parties disagree, they will arbitrate. Not as a legal but as a practical matter, though, if Qwest could voluntarily incorporate input from CLECs into the form of the template, the process should be more efficient for everyone. If Qwest wants to obtain a new generation of interconnection agreements with CLECs, it seems to be in Qwest's interest to help simplify the process. The more information Qwest provides with the template, the simpler the process.

As background, in response to inquiries by Eschelon, Linda Miles had initially said that she thought Qwest was working on a comparison document that would show the differences, by state, in the various SGATs. This would have been helpful to Eschelon, which was not an active participant in the development of those SGATs. Other CLECs in the same position would also benefit from such a comparison. During Eschelon's last conversation with Linda, she said that she had learned that Qwest was NOT creating a comparison. Instead, Qwest is creating a template proposed agreement based on at least one SGAT(s). Linda said that the template may highlight some state-specific differences in the SGATs, but it wasn't clear to us whether it would highlight them all. Eschelon does not know the differences, because it wasn't able to participate in the proceedings. Linda said that she had anticipated that the template would be available by the end of 1st quarter but now thought it would be later.

**Eschelon requests that Qwest provide source information (through footnotes or redlining, etc.) in the template agreement that Qwest is in the process of preparing for interconnection agreement negotiations.** If Qwest indicates which SGAT sections are pulled from, for example, every CLEC will not need to independently search for a piece of information that is already known to Qwest. Early on, Eschelon had asked Qwest to use Eschelon's existing contract (the AT&T contract) as a base for negotiations. Qwest insisted on using the SGAT instead. If Qwest is only willing to negotiate from that document, with which it has the most familiarity, it seems fair that Qwest provide its template in a user-friendly format that helps address the difference in knowledge level about the content. Identifying where the sections come from (whether negotiated as part of a 271 workshop in an identified state or ordered in a specified commission order) will help eliminate questions.

In the past, Eschelon found that, if one state ruled in the CLECs favor on an issue, Qwest did not necessarily bring that into the interconnection agreement discussions. Generally, in the

previous Qwest language, from Eschelon's perspective, Qwest took more of a lowest common denominator approach (including only what was ordered by every state, or ordered in some states to Qwest's advantage, but NOT including things favorable to CLECs but only ordered in certain states). **Eschelon requests that the latter category of language also be included in the template, at least for the state(s) in which Qwest has been ordered to offer it.** For example, Washington apparently made a ruling relating to the build issue that is reflected in the WA SGAT but not other SGATs. (For purposes of this example, we're assuming the language was favorable to CLECs and not desired by Qwest.) Will the template include the WA build language (identifying it as state-specific for WA), or will each CLEC have to review every SGAT to find such differences? If Qwest is willing to offer it in only certain states, the template can say so.

**Eschelon also asks that Qwest update CLECs as to the status of the template and when available (through CMP meetings or otherwise).** More information about the template would be beneficial to CLECs as they decide how to approach obtaining the next generation of interconnection issues. This will also be beneficial to Qwest to help it avoid the same requests about the template from multiple CLECs when the template becomes available.

Negotiations should proceed more quickly if the Parties understand Qwest's proposal and where the language comes from. Please let us know if Qwest will incorporate this feedback into its template development. If CLECs could receive more information about the template, they may have other helpful suggestions to make the negotiation process more efficient for all. I'll share this request with other CLECs in case they have anything to add to it. Thanks,

Karen L. Clauson  
Sr. Director of Interconnection  
Eschelon Telecom, Inc.  
730 2nd Ave. South, Suite 1200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
[contact information redacted]